SPEECH

OF

HON. DR. TUPPER

ON THE

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

(*Hansard* Report.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 21st April, 1877.

SUPPLY.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr. CARTWRIGHT moved:

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply."

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the motion of which I gave notice to the House, I may say, at the outset, that I intend, so far as possible, in the remarks I shall have to make in reference to this very important question, to endeavour to pursue the course which the hon. the First Minister marked out for himself in the observations he addressed to the House on this subject yesterday. He said he intended to deal with the subject, apart from Parliamentary considerations of a party or political character. Now, I am afraid it will not be in my power altogether to pursue that course; but in dealing with a question of such magnitude as the policy of the Government in connection with railways to the great national work of the country, I will confine myself, as much as I can, to a statement of the facts in regard to the course pursued by the Government as they present themselves to my mind, and, so far as may be possible, without drawing into the consideration of the question anything calculated to turn the attention of the House aside from the real merits of the subject under discussion. It is fortunate that, at the outset, both parties are able to agree as to one point—that is, not only to the importance, but, I may add, the necessity of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. the First Minister has himself, on more than one occasion, given to the House his own emphatic opinion that the construction of this work was a matter of the gravest public necessity. It is quite impossible for any person to look at the position that Canada occupies without arriving at that conclusion. We had obtained possession of a vast and magnificent country—the fertile prairies of the North-West—and it became at once apparent that if that boundless field for cultivation and for settlement, a country in extent and fertility not to be surpassed by any country on the face of the globe, were to be utilized and made to subserve the interests of Canada as it ought to subserve them, means of rapid and easy intercommunication between the old and settled portions of Canada and that fertile section of country, the prairies of the North-West should be estab-

1877
(2)

lished as early as possible. Then, when we came to look at the position which British Columbia occupied, the necessity became still greater. The importance of adding British Columbia to the consolidated British North American Provinces comprised in the Dominion of Canada, requires no argument at my hands. It was only necessary to look at the position Columbia occupied, extending along a considerable portion of the Pacific coast, and lying in proximity to our neighbours to the south of the line, to see that, if we were to derive the advantages desirable, that if this country was to obtain the consolidation that was necessary, it was certainly necessary that, at as early a period as possible, a line of railway should be established from one end of this country to the other, uniting and consolidating it. It was under that impression that the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway became a part of the policy of the late Government. It is quite true that measures had been suggested, and suggested by parties from that Province, which, while involving the necessity for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, deferred to a more remote period the accomplishment of the work; but when the Government came to examine and investigate the whole of that question, they came to the conclusion that the most economical mode—the mode most advantageous to the interests of British Columbia, as well as of all Canada—would be to enter upon that work, and, if possible, secure, as far as the means of the country would permit, the construction of that railway as promptly as was possible. A great deal has been said with regard to the arrangements made on that occasion. It would not have been necessary for me at this time to direct the attention of the House for a single instant to the legislation which has taken place, or to the proceedings in Parliament in reference to this question, but for a statement, which, I am sure, was inadvertently made by the hon. the First Minister on a former occasion,—that down to 1873 no scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had been propounded. The House will remember that on the 1st of April, 1871 (and I will only turn to public records in regard to these matters, if hon. gentlemen should question the statement I am making to the House), the address containing the terms of Union between British Columbia and Canada was passed in this House. Hon. members will remember that during the progress of the discussion on the question of the terms upon which British Columbia should be admitted as a part of this Dominion, great exception was taken to the undertaking, that the surveys for the railway should be immediately commenced, vigorously prosecuted and the road itself constructed within ten years. After a good deal of controversy in regard to this matter, the late lamented Sir George Cartier, who was then leading the House in the absence of the right hon. member for Kingston who was then in Washington, with a view to set at rest all doubts on that point, and to remove from the minds of every person any misapprehension or fear that the financial position of the country would be too seriously involved by undertaking to carry out so great a work, moved a resolution defining the terms and limiting distinctly the engagement we were undertaking. That resolution declared that the road should only be constructed as a private undertaking, that all the Government had to do was to provide a grant of money and of land such as the ability of the country would enable it to give, and that the construction of the work should not involve an increase in the rate of taxation. I will read the resolution to the House, in order that its terms may be distin[illegible] understood. It is as follows:—

"That the railway [illegible]erred to in the Address to Her [illegible] concerning the Union of Britis[illegible]ia with Canada, adopted by this [illegible] Saturday, the 1st of April, instant [illegible] be constructed and worked by priva[illegible]rise and not by the Dominion Gover[illegible] and that the public aid to be given [illegible]re that undertaking should consist of [illegible]beral grants of land and such subsidy [illegible]ney or other aid, not unduly pressing on the industries and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine."

Now, although a good many points were the subjects of controversy

B2395

between the two sides of the House, between the late Government and hon. gentlemen who were in opposition to that Government, this question was not one of them. The policy propounded in the resolution submitted by Sir George Cartier commended itself not only to the judgment of the supporters of the Government, but to both sides of the House, without a single exception. The only objection taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to the resolution, which seemed to be sufficiently distinct in its terms, was, not any doubt as to the policy proposed, but it was held that the terms were not strong enough in declaring that the road should not be constructed by the Dominion Government; and Mr. Dorion, then a member of this House, moved in amendment to add to the motion, not to alter a word in it to change any part of its terms, the words "and not otherwise." The object was to make it stronger. We held that the resolution which declared that the railway should not be constructed by the Dominion Government, but that it should be constructed by a private company, aided by a grant of land and money, was sufficiently strong, and rendered it impossible for any Government, without the express sanction of this House, to endeavour for a single moment to depart from these terms. The hon. the First Minister has characterized the engagement made by the Parliament of Canada, as stated by me to the House, in very strong terms. He has, as will be seen on reference to the debate in 1876, used the following language:—

"Let me say, so far as the work is concerned, that I have always been an advocate of the construction of a railway across the continent, but I have never believed that it was within our means to do it in anything like the period of time within which the hon. gentleman bound Parliament and the country."

I am glad to be able to establish that point which will be conceded by every one, that the hon. gentleman had always been a strong advocate of the construction of this railway across the continent. So as to the main question regarding the necessity of the work, it will be found that both sides of the House agree. The hon. gentleman continued:

"I believe the bargain was an act of madness—of utter insanity, and an evidence of political incapacity that has had no parallel in this or in any other country, that I am aware of."

The language contained in that statement is very strong, and it will become my duty in a few moments to turn the attention of the House to the position which the Government occupied on that question, which the hon. gentleman felt himself warranted in characterising as an "act of madness and utter insanity." It will be remembered that the address passed the House on the 1st day of April, and on the 11th the resolution which I have just read was passed, preventing the Government undertaking to construct the Pacific Railway until they could obtain a private company, who, with such a grant of lands and money as the country could afford, without increasing the taxation of the people, would undertake the work. That last clause might, on the surface, seem somewhat unreasonable, but I will call the attention of the House to this fact: That, during the first seven years of Confederation, as the hon. the Finance Minister was able to prove by public documents in London, we had not only carried on liberally the public service, and reduced the rate of taxation $2,000,000 per annum, but we had also contributed something like $16,000,000 to capital expenditure, including the sinking fund, causing the reduction of the public debt to that amount from the surplus revenue. If hon. gentlemen will remember that, they will see that it was quite within the power of the Government to undertake the work without increasing the rate of taxation at all. I may be asked "What reason have you to suppose that the prosperity of the country would continue?" In reply, I will ask any hon. member what he believes the result of the accomplishment of the scheme of the late Government would have been in relation to the financial condition of Canada to-day. Suppose the late Government had succeeded in doing that which they endeavoured to accomplish—floating that scheme in London for the construction of the railway upon the terms stated—I would ask any hon. gentleman what the

result would have been of bringing such an enormous amount of foreign capital into the country, giving early, complete and rapid communication with the great fertile prairies of the North-West, and pouring an enormous tide of immigrants into that country to become taxpayers with ourselves, and to lighten the burdens which now rest upon our own shoulders. I think that there is not an hon. member in this House who would not be ready to believe that, had it been possible to accomplish what was proposed under this scheme, and to secure the construction of this railway on the terms stated, that the steadily rising tide of Canada's prosperity would not have stopped, or, at all events, that we should have maintained the position which we then occupied. But I may be told that it was on the first of April that the Address was passed, and that it was not until the 11th that it was qualified by this resolution. The House must remember that we were not dealing with a foreign Power or with parties who were prepared to take any rigid or technical advantage of the Government; but we were dealing with those who were to be a portion of ourselves, who would have a common interest with ourselves in having the work prosecuted in the way most advantageous to the country, and who would be deeply interested that the financial credit of Canada should not be imperilled, or that any result should follow which would be injurious to the country to which they had irrevocably linked their own fortunes. But I have still more conclusive evidence in relation to that matter. It will be remembered that when the Address was passing the House we had then present in Ottawa some of the delegates from British Columbia, who had been authorized to represent the Province in those negotiations, and prominent among them was Mr. Trutch, the late Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia. I will trouble the House for a few moments by reading an extract from the speech he made at the banquet provided for his entertainment. He said:—

"We from British Columbia were prepared to accept the amendment of the scheme, and we accordingly proceeded to calculate the time it would probably take to build the railroad, and we agreed upon an estimated period of ten years. If it had been put at twelve or fifteen years, British Columbia would have been just as well satisfied, and if the estimated period had been reduced to eight years, she would scarcely have been better pleased. But some definite period for the completion of this work *the British Columbians insisted on* as a necessary safeguard to our colony in entering into the proposed union. To argue that any other interpretation will be placed upon the railway engagement by British Columbia than that which I have given to you as my construction of it, to argue that she expects it to be carried out in the exact interpretation of the words themselves, regardless of all consequences, is a fallacy which cannot bear the test of common sense.

"The case stands thus: British Columbia is about to enter into a partnership with Canada, and one of the terms of the articles of partnership is, that we are, under the partnership, to construct a railroad upon certain conditions. Is British Columbia going to hold her partner to that which will bring ruin and bankruptcy upon the firm? Surely you would think us fools indeed, if we adopted such a course. I would protest, and the whole of British Columbia would protest, if the Government proposed to borrow $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 to construct this road; running the country into debt, and taxing the people of British Columbia as well as of the rest of the Dominion, to pay the burden of such a debt."

I will not occupy the time of the House by reading further, but the speech is much longer, and has a great deal more in it to the same purpose. What I have read, however, contains the point of the case. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance in introducing his Budget Speech in 1874, also alluded to this question; and as a great deal has been said by the First Minister who has used the terms "madness, insanity and utter incapacity" in connection with this act on the part of the late Government, I may, perhaps, be excused for taking up a little of the time of the House in meeting and, I think, disposing of at once and forever, I trust with all reasonable men, any charge based on such terms as those. In referring to this resolution, which qualified this engagement, the Minister of Finance said:

"So very strong was the feeling that it was afterwards determined that a certain resolution should be placed on the Journals of the House, which, indeed, was actually done, and by which it was declared that, although we had committed ourselves to this claim, it was only on condition that the road should be made in a certain fashion, and that no

excessive burden should be placed on the resources of the country."

It would be difficult, Sir, to find language more appropriately or more lucidly conveying exactly what the action of the late Government and of Parliament in this matter had been. He also says:—

"I have also been informed that the British Columbia delegates were themselves assenting parties to this resolution."

"That, however, I do not know of my own personal knowledge. This I do know, that I myself called the attention of Sir George Cartier, the then Minister of Militia, to this extraordinary provision, asking him if he had communicated it to the Legislature of British Columbia. Some one of the delegates was then sitting near the chair of the Speaker, I am not sure which of them, but I think it was Governor Trutch."

Sir George Cartier's reply was that:

"There was no need to do so, because the delegates were fully cognizant of the whole matter and were assenting parties thereto. And, although I do not say we can or will dissent from the consequences of our legal obligations, I do say that at any rate the people of British Columbia had very fair notice of what the intention and meaning of this House was when these obligations were undertaken."

I give this, Sir, as the testimony—I will not say of a hostile witness—but of an hon. gentleman, who was disposed himself to criticise, with a great deal of severity, the course which the late Government had pursued in entering into this engagement. Then we had recess at six o'clock, and the hon. gentleman returned at 7.30 o'clock and resumed his speech. He had investigated the matter in the meantime, and he then made some further observations which I will read to the House. He says:

"Before I proceed further, I desire to correct an error that I fell into with regard to the resolution of April, 1871, passed after the treaty with British Columbia was agreed to. I had been under the impression that that resolution declared that the Pacific Railway should be built without unduly increasing the taxation of Canada. The actual text is stronger still. Sir George Cartier moved and Mr. Tilley seconded a resolution setting forth that the railway referred to in the Act concerning the union between British Columbia with Canada, adopted on Saturday, the 1st of April, should be constructed by a company formed of private individuals, and not by the Dominion Government; that the company building it should be assisted by liberal money subsidies and liberal grants of land, provided always, that no increase of the then rate of taxation should hereafter be determined on in consequence."

The hon. gentleman, in revising his speech, has very properly put the words "no increase" in italics, it being the strongest feature of the resolution. The hon. gentleman continued:—

"That, Sir, was the resolution placed upon our Journals on the motion of Sir George E. Cartier, seconded by Mr. Tilley. It was of value for the reason I have alluded to, because it was represented to us at the time it was passed that the delegates from British Columbia were assenting parties thereto."

Now, Sir, I think that I am not required to take up much more time on that feature of the subject, but I may say that following up the resolution meeting the engagement which the late Government assumed, and which Parliament assumed in relation to this matter, it became the duty of the Government to bring before the House what they considered a liberal grant of land and a sufficient aid in public money in order to accomplish this work without increasing the rate of taxation; and, Sir, we submitted to the House resolutions which will be found on the 145th page of the Journals of 1872, declaring that this House would grant $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land for that work; and we also provided, in addition to this, that the Pembina Branch should be embraced in the resolutions, and should have a subsidy of 20,000 acres of land, and that the branch connecting the line with Lake Superior should have a subsidy of 25,000 acres of land per mile. Now Sir, we may leave the Lake Superior branch out of consideration altogether, for this reason: it was then supposed that it would be absolutely necessary to go north of Lake Nipigon in order to obtain a line at all, but by subsequent surveys it has been found, and on both sides of the House it has been agreed, and both the late and present Governments were quite agreed on the question, that, as matters now stand, whenever the main line is constructed, at whatever time that may be, that a fair, passable line has been found skirting the shores of Lake Superior within some ten miles of Lake Superior, and, therefore, this disposes altogether of

this question of branches, with the exception of the Pembina Branch. We therefore committed the House and country distinctly to the undertaking of providing $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land for any company found possessed of sufficient means and resources to undertake the construction of that work. The First Minister has again and again referred in very strong terms to the inadequacy of that appropriation; but, Sir, I think I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have better evidence than that of any opinion the First Minister is capable of giving on this question. The First Minister is a gentleman of undoubted talent and ability and of high standing in the country; and although I do not suppose that he is at all wanting in appreciation of his great powers, I am quite certain that he will not himself undertake to put his judgment, on a purely commercial question against the opinions of many other gentlemen who are to be found in the country; and when I tell him that the very ablest men—I am not speaking of gentlemen connected with the late Government or having political sympathies with it—who have shown by their successful commercial enterprises, and by their great financial ability, they had been able to acquire vast fortunes for themselves, thus giving the best evidence to the country of their ability to judge on commercial questions—were most eager to obtain acts of incorporation to enable them to undertake the construction of this work on the terms proposed, when I state that, I shall give the House better evidence than any opinion of the First Minister, that the scheme was not a bad scheme, that there was no insanity in the proceedings, and that, in fact, it was one which at that time and in the light of information then obtained in this country upon this subject, was regarded by the first commercial minds of Canada as an eminently practical scheme. When I give the names of the Hon. Mr. McMaster and the Hon. David Christie and, also the present hon. Minister of Customs, who shows himself possessed of financial ability as far as investing money and the transaction of business goes, I give hon. gentlemen the best evidence that it was not a wild visionary scheme, but that it was a practical scheme which commended itself to the judgments of those best able to form an opinion in relation to it. What were the consequences to the late Government? Was this proposition to give 50,000,000 acres of land and $30,000,000 in money regarded as utterly inadequate? No; the late Government was destroyed in a desperate struggle between the first commercial men of all parties in Canada to obtain possession of the Charter on those terms. I do not require to occupy the time longer to show that we were not open to the charge of proposing anything visionary or illusionary. It was a solid substantial project which, if carried out, would have accomplished untold benefits to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite will all admit that the greatest boon which could be conferred upon Canada would be the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon those terms. They were all agreed upon that. We are all agreed upon the desirability of this work, which would be of such immense advantage to Canada, being secured under the terms which Parliament was induced to grant for that purpose. The scheme was defeated. I am afraid if I were to go into that branch of the question I should be doing what I said I would not do, namely, that I would not say anything that could be understood as directed by party feeling or political sentiment, and that I would not for a single moment divert the attention of the House from the question under consideration. But I believe the time will, if it has not already come, when it will be regarded as the greatest misfortune the country ever suffered that that scheme was defeated, and that hon. gentlemen should have—I am afraid I must say in the interest of party—adopted measures to defeat it, which not only prevented its accomplishment by those who had then undertaken to deal with the work, but had thrown almost insuperable obstacles in the way of their successors or of any other Government. However, it was done, rightly or wrongly,

justly or unjustly. The late Government were defeated, and hon. gentlemen opposite were charged with the important duty of governing the country, and one of the greatest and most important duties that devolved upon them was the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am bound to say that it is deeply to be lamented that party considerations ever entered into this question. It is a question so gigantic in its proportions, and of such enormous interest and importance to the country, that it demanded then, as it demands now, that party considerations should be left entirely in abeyance; and that men of all parties and of all classes should unite, and endeavour to assist, whoever may be the Government of the day, in any wise or judicious measures that are calculated to accomplish the object. I may not be able to look dispassionately upon questions in which the Government are concerned, but, as far as I am able to do so, it is my desire, as it ought to be of every hon. member of this House and every patriotic man of whatever party, to assist any Government in carrying forward any wise or judicious measures, by which a work so important may become accomplished. And now came the great test of finding out whether hon. gentlemen in power carried out the views they held when in Opposition. Hon. gentleman were called upon to deal with this question, and I am bound to say, that they have not maintained in power the principles they professed when they sat upon the Opposition benches. I have shown that the hon. Mr. Dorion moved a resolution on the matter, and that the House was unanimous upon the question as to how the road was to be constructed. But, not satisfied with the clear, unqualified declaration that the road was not to be built by the Dominion Government, he wanted to add a "rider" to declare "and not otherwise," so as to make it impossible for the road to be built except by a private company, aided by a grant of land and money from the Government. I think the hon. member for Chateauguay seconded that resolution; but, at all events, I am able to say that the gentlemen sustaining the present First Minister voted a solid and unanimous vote with Mr. Dorion in reference to that question. This gave to the country the most unqualified and solemn pledge that public men can give to a people, that if they obtained power they would carry out the policy to which they had thus committed themselves. The hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government was called upon to form an Administration, and he had to present himself before his constituents. The late Government had, before that, appealed to the country, and their policy had been sustained. The hon. gentleman, when he went before his constituents, without any sanction from the members of the House, without Parliament having been consulted, constructed a new platform and declared his intention of building the road as a Government road. The reason he adduced was that the profits which would go to the contractors under the original scheme would go to the people. I will read the words of the hon. gentleman from the organ of the Government, and an organ which the hon. gentleman will hardly be able to repudiate, because upon the testimony of an hon. member of this House, it was an organ to which he had himself contributed a very large sum of money, in order to buy it over from an Opposition paper into an organ of the Government. I refer to the *Times* of this city, which reported the hon. gentleman as follows:

"It will be the duty, as I think it will be the desire of the Government, to develop any plan by which these results are to be accomplished. * * * Any profit, Sir, that would have come to the share of the company will ultimately fall, under our scheme, to the share of the country. * * * It may be necessary for us to let the work out in contracts, under our own superintendence, but, at any rate, we shall take care that our attention is given to the interests and money of the country."

True to the course the hon. gentleman stated there, he introduced a Bill providing for the construction of this work by the Government, giving the Government power to deal with the whole of this work from end to end as a Government work. The hon. gentleman says that measure passed the House unanimously. He is hardly candid, Sir, in making such a state-

ment to this House, if he means the House and the country to believe that it met the concurrence of all the members of this House. He must remember, or, if matters of too great importance have rendered him forgetful of it, I remember that the Bill was rushed through this House at a late hour of the night, the Government refusing, when the Opposition entreated them to give them more time, to delay it and give time for further consideration. He knows that, under the Saxby gale, under the great tidal wave of political excitement which swept over the country in 1874, the Opposition were under great disadvantage; he knows that we were taunted, as, happily, we cannot be taunted now, with being a corporal's guard, and I admit that we were not strong enough to protect the interests of the country as an Opposition is bound to protect them, and as, I am happy to say, we are able to protect them in this House to-day. When the hon. gentleman says, however, it was unanimous, he makes the statement in face of the fact that I myself spoke in my place in the House—spoke much longer, no doubt, than was pleasant to the hon. gentleman and many of his supporters—against the enactment of that measure, and declared that I regarded the undertaking to build this Canadian Pacific Railway by the Government, apart from the policy previously sanctioned by Parliament and the people, as one which could not commend itself to the House, and would be fraught, I was afraid, with disastrous results to the country. There was, at all events, a very strong feeling on the part of the Opposition that the hon. gentleman was taking a step from which he was precluded by his past policy and pledged action in the House, and which, in our judgment, at all events, the public interests did not sanction. But the hon. gentleman also superadded to that the Georgian Bay branch. Let me say a single word in reference to that measure: It is known that I strenuously opposed in this House the proposal for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch. Why did I oppose it? It was because I regarded the abandonment of the policy of securing at an early day the construction of a direct line of railway from Nipissing to the great prairies of the North-West, as a great misfortune for the people of this country. I regarded carrying a line of railway to a lake which would be frozen six or seven months in the year as involving a large expenditure without the country ever receiving any commensurate advantage. I did not oppose it on its own merits, but in contrast to that route for which I felt the valley of the Ottawa had been intended by nature. If anyone looks at the configuration of this continent, if anyone looks at the position of this Dominion to-day, if anyone will regard the four millions of Canadians who are settled in this portion of the country, and the great fertile prairies of the North-West that would require the construction of, perhaps, a thousand miles of railway to bring us in connection with them, he must feel that we are throwing away perhaps one of the greatest possible advantages to be derived from the construction of this great national highway, if we adopt any expedient by which we should relegate to the remote future completion of a direct line of railway to the valley of the Ottawa, bringing us the products of the North-West, inhabited, as it would be at no distant date, by millions of intelligent, thrifty, industrious people. But the hon. gentleman felt, Sir, that the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch was a matter of such vital necessity that we could not afford to wait a moment, that, notwithstanding his pledges and all his declarations that parliamentary government required that every appropriation of public money should be first sanctioned by Parliament, he must take *carte blanche* to construct that work without the formality of submitting the contract to Parliament, and he obtained the sanction of his supporters to carry it on in that way, and a large sum of money was placed at his disposal to carry out that policy. And, Sir, his policy embraced the subsidizing of lines of railway both in Ontario and Quebec. A good deal of controversy has arisen as to what he meant by his declaration in his manifesto that he purposed to subsidize lines of railway in Ontario and Quebec to connect the Georgian Bay Branch with the system

nere. We all know now that the subsidy to the Canada Central is the prominent feature in connection with that policy, but I took the opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman when making his statement in 1874—he was good enough to allow me to interrupt him by asking: "Are you to subsidise one branch or two branches?" Are you to connect with the railways from Toronto as well as with the railways in this section of the country? And his answer was: "Two branches." So whatever policy he may have adopted afterwards, his policy then was to give subsidies to connect with the Toronto system, as well as with the Ottawa system of railways. I only make allusion to that in passing. But, as I have stated, the matter of the Georgian Bay Branch was considered so pressing and of such vital interest that the hon. gentleman took power to exempt the contract made in regard to it from the control of this House. The hon. gentleman has also undertaken the construction of a railway from Thunder Bay to Red River. I hold that was a contravention of the Act, and I will tell the hon. gentleman briefly why. The Act for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway provided that it should be divided into four sections. The Act read:—

"The whole line of the said railway, for the purpose of its construction, shall be divided into four parts; the first section to begin at a point near to and south of Lake Nipissing, and to extend towards the upper or western end of Lake Superior, to a point where it shall intersect the second section hereinafter mentioned."

Now, where is that point. The hon. gentleman told us yesterday—he did not require to do so, because Mr. Fleming in his report has pointed it out, as will be seen by reference to the 55th page—that it is not the intention that the commencement of the line at Thunder Bay shall be any other than a branch. Mr. Fleming says:—

"A practical route, without excessively heavy works, is reported, establishing the fact that the trunk line from the prairie to the eastern terminus in Ontario may, in the future, be carried in a direct course, without making a detour to Thunder Bay. The line now under construction to Fort William will then constitute a short branch from the main line to the navigation of Lake Superior."

The hon. gentlemen provided by his Act, by the construction of two branches—the Georgian Bay Branch and the Pembina Branch. That was all; the rest were to be the four sections, and in the Act it is declared that the first section shall run to the point where it intersects the second section running on to Red River. The hon. gentleman told us this would be a branch from Taunder Bay of 25 or 30 miles. Those who have looked at Mr. Fleming's map will see that if anything is to be judged from the configuration of the country from the line traced there that it would be near sixty or seventy miles, certainly much nearer fifty miles than 25 or 30 miles. I hold, therefore, that the hon. gentleman, in departing from the policy to which he was committed by his speech introducing this subject, in which he spoke of Nepigon as the particular point of intersection, has made a mistake, and that the construction of that branch is without authority, and that there is no appropriation of public money which can legally be used for that purpose. The hon. gentleman admitted himself yesterday that the bay where the trunk line would approach Lake Superior near Nepigon Bay, would be easier of access from Sault St. Marie, from the objective point, than Thunder Bay. We all know that very elaborate evidence was submitted in the report of the Chief Engineer to establish the fact that there is no point except Nepigon Bay which would have been equally beneficial to the country, and avoided altogether the construction of this branch or any detour to run in that direction. Therefore, in that respect, the hon. gentleman has acted without law, and constructed what has been done without appropriation from Parliament. But I now come to a much more important feature of the policy of the hon. gentleman than any which I have yet criticised—the terms made by the hon. gentleman with Lord Carnarvon—the solemn treaty entered into between the Government of British Columbia, and binding the Government also to the Imperial Government. I have shown that every step taken by the House up to the change of Govern-

ment, was taken under the guard provided in the resolution—that the road should be constructed by a private company, aided by grants of land and money; and that all obligations we had incurred in relation to British Columbia or the Imperial Government, or anybody else, were all limited by the open and avowed policy declared by that resolution. I may say that the effect of that resolution could not be better illustrated than by the fact the hon. gentleman himself, when he found it necessary in his own defence to quote that resolution, quoted it as an unanswerable argument to British Columbia. I will now refer to a Minute of Council passed December 20th, 1875, which says:—

"It must be borne in mind that every step in the negotiations was necessarily predicated upon and subject to the conditions of the resolution of the House of Commons passed in 1871, contemporaneously with the adoption of the Terms of Union with British Columbia, subsequently enacted in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1872, and subsequently enacted, after a large addition had been made to the rate of taxation, in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874; that the public aid to be given to secure the accomplishment of this undertaking should consist of such 'liberal grants of land, and such subsidies in money or other aid, not increasing the then rate of taxation, as the Parliament of Canada should thereafter determine.'"

One of the complaints made against the hon. the First Minister is that he is inclined to be an autocrat. One of the complaints is that while courting the sweet voices of the people he spoke of the necessity of a Ministry having the authority of Parliament and the sanction of the people for every important act in which they were engaged but that no sooner did he get the high position which he now fills than he seemed to throw off all Parliamentary restraint, and to regard his own *ipse dixit* and the opinions of the Ministry with which he is associated as the only power to be recognized, or the only one to which he required to pay any attention. The hon. gentleman made an engagement, which will only occupy a moment in reading, and which will be found extended at length at page 911, *Hansard*, 1875. This engagement was made in November, 1876, during the recess of Parliament, after the Session in which he obtained power to deal with the whole question as a Government work, taking it entirely out of the category of a private enterprise. But still we had, as the hon. gentleman admits, re-enacted the clause providing that the work should not be proceeded with any faster than could be done without increasing the existing rate of taxation. I myself have a strong opinion as to the extent to which that resolution was qualified by the clause the hon. gentleman caused to be inserted in the Act of 1874, and where the terms of the resolution itself was departed from by taking power to construct the railway as a Government work which the resolution required could only be done by a private company. The hon. gentleman engaged to expend two millions per annum in British Columbia and to commence the railway the moment that the surveys were completed, and if the hon. gentleman has determined to spend another year in additional surveys, and surveys with reference to points, as far as the location of the route is concerned, which I stated yesterday, appear to me to be uncalled for—some little consolation for that state of things may, perhaps, be found in the fact that he was bound under those terms and is bound under those terms, to expend two millions per annum on the road immediately on the completion of the surveys in British Columbia, and it was just possible, in the existing state of things, that the hon. gentleman does not feel himself quite prepared to engage in the expenditure of two millions per annum in British Columbia, in the present condition of public affairs. These terms, which are of a very extraordinary character, are detailed substantially as follows:—

"Lastly, that on or before the 31st of December, 1890, the Railway shall be completed and open for traffic from the Pacific seaboard to a point at the West end of Lake Superior, at which it will fall into connection with existing lines of railway through a portion of the United States, and also with the navigation on Canadian waters."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, as I have stated, first took power to construct this work directly by the Government and then made a solemn binding treaty with British Columbia and the Imperial Government, that by 1890

this work should be constructed and completed from the Pacific coast to the shores of Lake Superior. What is the distance between these points? It is something like, according to the Chief Engineer's statement, 2,022 miles over which the road was to be built; and the hon. gentleman made this engagement without the slightest qualification or the slightest provision that it was not to increase the existing rate of taxation. He made a binding, solemn treaty, and the good faith of the Government of this country was pledged as far as a Minister—and a Minister has power to pledge it to a great extent—could pledge it without consultation with the House; and, without the knowledge of the House, the hon. gentleman entered into this engagement. In inviting his attention to it I would like to ask him whether the act of the late Government in engaging to subsidise with $30,000,000 of money and 50,000,000 acres of land a Company to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, was a madder scheme, a more insane scheme, or a scheme exhibiting greater incapacity than was this scheme proposed by an hon. gentleman holding the views which he did in reference to the character of that work, as stated by himself. Sir, over his own signature previous to the appeal made to the people, he published a manifesto containing the views and opinions of the Government in relation to this matter, and giving his opinion as to the cost of this work. He stated, Sir, in that manifesto, in January, 1874, his views in reference to this work at some considerable length:—

"In the meantime, with a view to obtain a speedy means of communication across the continent, and to facilitate the construction of the railway itself, it will be our policy to utilise the enormous stretches of magnificent water communication which lie between a point not far from the Rocky Mountains and Fort Garry, and between Lake Superior and French River on the Georgian Bay, thus avoiding, for the present, the construction of about 1,300 miles of railway, estimated to cost from sixty to eighty millions of dollars, and rendering the resources of the country available for the prosecution of those links."

Now, Sir, in this statement, and I shall draw the attention of the House to it by-and-bye, the hon. gentleman estimated the saving of the 600 miles between Nipissing and Nepigon, and between Red River and the remaining 700 miles westward—because these were the water stretches and the only water stretches he covers in his manifesto—he estimated that 1,300 miles of railway, 700 miles of it through the prairie region, at from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000. That 1,300 miles of this road, and that, not the most unfavourable portion of it, more than half being prairie country, was going to cost between sixty and eighty millions of dollars; and in the face of that declaration, which I presume he would not make without having gone into some calculations with reference to it, the lowest calculation involving an enormous expenditure of money, this engagement was made by the hon. gentleman without any reserve, and without the slightest qualification as to whether the resources of the country would admit of it. Now, as we stood up to that period, we had a safety valve, and a clause exempting the country from being plunged headlong into a ruinous expenditure, but this was all swept away by the hon. gentleman who presented himself to this House with the declaration that this was a binding treaty which he had made, not only with a portion of ourselves, with our fellow citizens in British Columbia, but also with the Imperial Government, which was solemnly called on to take part in the negotiations effecting that arrangement. Now, Sir, I would draw the attention of the House for one moment to this question as one of great importance, because it has involved the most serious charge against the hon. gentleman and his Government that was ever made, or that ever could be made against any Government; it has involved the charge of bad faith. I hold, Sir, that serious as were the financial arrangements and great as were the pecuniary difficulties with which he surrounded this question, that by this arrangement, even that sank into insignificance compared with the question of having the good faith of the Government of Canada challenged, not only by the Province, and the important Province of British Columbia, a portion of ourselves, but also, Sir, broadcast throughout the

world, through Great Britain and wherever the name of Canada was known. Up to that hour, Sir, no spot, no stain could rest on the reputation of the Government of Canada with relation to any engagement that it had ever made; but, I say that the charge of bad faith was brought against, and has been sustained against, the hon. gentleman, by arguments and by evidence so conclusive as to involve great trouble and great difficulty, I am afraid, on his part, in order to extricate himself from it; and as, Sir, there is no advantage to be gained in concealing from ourselves the true nature of the case, and as it is the painful duty of the surgeon, occasionally, as the first step towards the cure, to probe a wound to the very bottom, I feel myself called upon, for a few moments, to touch upon and examine that most important feature of this question. I may be told that I have had my answers, and that, too, from a very high quarter; —that His Excellency the Governor General, who has the best, and the most intimate means of judging of Ministers, has, in distinct and unqualified terms, exonerated, at all events, the Prime Minister from any charge of bad faith in relation to this matter. I cannot allow that, Sir, to prevent me dealing with the subject, but I shall touch on that point as delicately as possible, as I feel that the distinguished gentleman who rightly enjoys the confidence of the people of this country as few Governor-Generals have done before, that men of all parties, and men of all classes recognize in him a gentleman who has devoted himself, heart and soul, to the best interests of Canada; and because no person will question his entire honesty in making the statement which he did, in reference to this matter. I will not discuss the question, Sir, of its constitutionality; but I say that it is one of the most serious charges against this Government, that they should render it necessary for the representative of the Crown to come down from the exalted position he holds, and take part in the discussion of political questions that agitate the country. Now, Sir, I say that the evidences of the breach of faith that have been raised on the part of the people of British Columbia, have not, in my judgment, been raised without a good deal of foundation. It will be remembered that the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Justice, then occupied an independent position in this House, and a very independent position at that moment, put a question on the notice paper. It was a very serious question, and it appears in the Votes and Proceedings on the 4th of March, 1875:—

"Mr. BLAKE—on Monday next—Enquiry of Ministry—Whether the Government intend to propose to Parliament any measure on the subject of the readjustment of the Terms of Union with British Columbia?"

Now, Sir, it is known that the hon. gentleman had, in addition to engaging to construct this railway, the 2,000 miles of railway which the Government had power to build as a Government work, and which, by the period of 1890, he was to have completed, also engaged to add to that, outside of this work altogether, the construction of the road from Nanaimo to Esquimault, sixty-eight miles of additional road. The Minister of Justice put this significant question on the notice paper, and what was his answer? The answer was given in the true spirit of the autocrat. The hon. gentleman said—but at that time, I suppose, he felt stronger than he did afterwards:—

"With respect to the question raised by my hon. friend from South Bruce, I may say I have nothing to ask from Parliament. We have no authority to obtain, but have merely to communicate this decision and rely upon the House supporting us in accepting the terms that have been made through the intervention, or intermediation, of Lord Carnarvon, and that support, I do not doubt, will be cheerfully accorded."

So the hon. gentleman had made an unqualified engagement with British Columbia and with the Imperial Parliament, to spend $2,000,000 per annum in British Columbia,—build 68 miles of railway from Nanaimo to Esquimalt, and finish the line from the Pacific to Lake Superior, 2,000 miles, by 1890. Yet his answer was that from Parliament he had nothing to ask. But he altered his mind. Some significant divisions took place in this House. The present Minister of Justice, then sitting on the Independent benches, voted against the hon. gentleman on

the Bill for the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway; and on a most important question, in which the legality of the proceedings of the Government in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway was involved, the hon. gentleman put on his hat and walked out of the House, accompanied by another gentleman, whose assistance the Government felt it necessary since to obtain on the Treasury benches as Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman had, before the Session was far advanced, some pretty strong hints that the position he had assumed, in which he undertook to deal with the most important financial interests of this country, and involving the most onerous obligations—obligations to which anything undertaken by the late Government seemed insignificant—was such that he was not as strong in the support of the House as he had led himself to believe. What occurred? The Bill was passed by this House by a large majority. This Bill provided for building the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway in addition to the rest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may be told that we contemplated building a road on Vancouver Island. We did. We had fixed upon a terminus at Esquimalt, but every person knows that that did not involve the additional cost of a dollar, as far as the financial resources of the country were concerned. The stipulation required that the parties obtaining the charter of the Pacific Railway should build this road, the subsidy to be the same as far as money was concerned. But the hon. gentleman changed his base. He, who to-day had nothing to ask from Parliament, to-morrow found it convenient to introduce a Bill for the purpose of constructing the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. He passed this Bill through the House despite the opposition of the present Minister of Justice and other leading members of the Opposition. The Bill was lost, however, and significantly lost in the Upper House by the votes of two of the warmest and strongest friends the hon. gentleman had in that branch of the Legislature. I am not going to say that it was lost at the instance of the First Minister, but I may say that his colleagues in the Upper House did not exhibit great enthusiasm in trying to obtain a majority. But the Bill having passed by a considerable majority in this House, was abandoned. This was a case in which the hon. gentleman could say: "The good faith of Canada is pledged; we are bound to the British Columbian and Imperial Governments to carry this out; I ask you to re-affirm the policy." The hon. gentleman could have used those efforts of moral suasion which are always in the power of a leader of the Government. But, no! He abandoned his policy, and an extraordinary occurrence presented itself. The hon. gentleman who was most hostile to the construction of this branch was taken into the Cabinet, as the result of a bargain that this road should be sacrificed. That statement may seem a strong one, but I will sustain it by a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Justice himself at Walkerton, in which he said that he would not enter the Cabinet until the Government had made up their minds to abandon their policy in this respect. The hon. gentleman said, as reported in the *Globe*:—

"He would now touch upon a question with respect to which he had not been in entire accordance with the gentleman who was conducting the affairs of the country. He referred to the settlement attempted to be made through the Earl of Carnarvon with British Columbia. He had been of opinion that that settlement was more onerous to the country than it was advantageous to agree to, and he was happy to be able to say that, previous to his accepting office, discussions had been entered upon which had resulted in an agreement upon a policy satisfactory to himself. He would not tell them that they might hope for as satisfactory a settlement of the dreadful burden imposed upon them by their predecessors as they would like, but he had every reason to hope that matters would be placed in a more satisfactory position than at one time they could expect they would be."

And what was that policy proposed by the present Minister of Justice? It was to dip their hands into the public treasury of Canada and hand $750,000 over to the people of British Columbia for local works. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that all that was necessary in case of any embarrassment that such a sum of public money should be paid as might meet the emergency. But the hon. First Minister, who had thus abandoned his policy, said to the people of British Columbia that he was defeated in the Senate, and that the Government were

compelled reluctantly to abandon the construction of the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway. My right hon. friend from Kingston and myself supported the Government in that proposition, and we voted for the second reading of the Bill. But when the hon. gentlemen refused to agree that the contracts should be submitted to Parliament, we voted against the third reading, and our friends in the Upper House voted entirely in harmony with us. The great substantial element of the policy of the Government, as arranged with Lord Carnarvon regarding the construction of the Pacific Railway, was still left intact. Although the Government were not going to build the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway, they were to carry out the rest of the terms as to the Pacific Railway. The terms were onerous. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen began to be alarmed. The hon. gentleman who had said that all the resources of the British Empire could not build the Pacific Railway in ten years had agreed to build 2,022 miles, from the head of Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, in thirteen years from this time, that is, by 1890.

Mr. CAUCHON: That is three years more.

Mr. HOLTON: The question is whether it would be easier to do the work by 1890 or 1881.

Mr. TUPPER: I say this: that the obligation on the part of Canada to give certain aid to a company which would find the capital to build the railway, and although the engagement was to finish it in ten years, yet, as has been shown by Mr. Trutch, if it could not be done in the ten years the time would have been extended, provided honest, straightforward and consciencious efforts were made to fulfil the obligation the Government incurred, that obligation was vastly superior, as none knew better than the hon. member for Chateauguay, than that the Government should proceed with the road as a Government work, taking every dollar of the money required from the public exchequer, and by a loan and debt placed on the shoulders of the people of the country build it by 1890. There is no comparison between the extent of obligation incurred in the two cases.

Mr. HOLTON: The two points are quite distinct. The relative advantage of the two modes of constructing the road, and the possibility of building the road within a given time. The latter was the point to which the hon. member was addressing himself when I ventured to throw across the floor the slight interruption. I say that, whereas, he agreed to finish the road by 1881, my hon. friend the First Minister proposed to build, not the whole but a considerable portion of the line by 1890, and the hon. member for Cumberland was denouncing him for undertaking an impossible task.

Mr. TUPPER: The hon. member for Chateauguay will see this—and he will see it very readily—that the essence of the objection was, there being a time bargain in the first instance. We were told by the delegates that they would not hold us to the ten or twelve years, but that we might have whatever time would reasonably be required in the construction of the work. But the great assault made was that it was a time bargain, although it was made with a portion of ourselves. But here is a bargain to which the Imperial Government became parties, made after hon. gentlemen have had further time for consideration, made to construct that portion of the line which will involve the longest time, viz., through the Cascade range and Rocky Mountains, made without any qualification as to whether the resources of the country will permit it.

Mr. HOLTON: Were the Imperial Government parties to the original engagements? Was is it not in the address which formed the basis of union?

Mr. TUPPER: The Imperial Government were parties, in so far as they were willing—for that was all they had to do—that British Columbia and Canada should unite on the terms we had mutually agreed upon. Here is a case in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies had come to accept the position of arbitrator in the carrying out the agrement made between Canada and British Columbia, to which the Imperial Government were parties.

Mr. HOLTON: Was not the ground of that interference of the Imperial Government that they were parties to the original agreement made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. TUPPER: The colony of British Columbia felt they were entitled to go to the Imperial Government to complain in regard to any violation by Canada of the terms mutually agreed upon. But to return. The main feature of the policy was still left, all except the railway on Vancouver Island. Did the Government maintain good faith as to that? The First Minister came to Parliament and proposed a vote—a moderate vote—to carry on works connected with the railway. What happened? If hon. gentlemen would turn to the *Hansard* for 1876, they will find the record of a very extraordinary procedure. They will find that the hon. First Minister, having become wise in his generation, found that he had committed himself to this unqualified engagement—a point not noticed by many members of the Opposition on the inception of the matter—that his solemn pledge was unrelieved by any action of the Senate, the pledge to construct the road from the shores of the Pacific to the shores of Lake Superior, over two thousand miles, by 1890. What happened when that item came up for the construction of the railway? What did the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) do? That hon. member is not a very recalcitrant supporter of the hon. the First Minister. I will not say he is not an independent member, but among the hon. gentleman's followers he has none more devoted than the hon. member for West Middlesex; there is no hon. member who will make a greater effort to act in accord with the First Minister, and, I believe, the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion showed the hon. the First Minister that he was prepared to make a sacrifice in order to meet his views. What did the hon. member for West Middlesex do? He moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government. We had been voting them the Supplies. We, like a loyal Opposition, had been endeavouring, as far as possible, to promote the interests of the country; but submitting to the fact that we were a minority, and must accept the general policy of the Government, and on many occasions vote them larger sums than we thought necessary in the interests of the country, or demanded by the necessity of the case. We recognised the obligation to assist the Government in carrying the Supply Bill. The hon. member for Middlesex, however, moved his vote of want of confidence, refusing to vote one dollar for the construction of the railway until the House had adopted the motion, which was in these terms:

"But, while granting this sum, this House desires to record its view that the arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be such as the resources of the country will permit, without increasing the existing rates of taxation."

The moment that resolution was moved the hon. the First Minister was bound to rise in his place and state that he would sacrifice his position as First Minister before he would accept it, because it involved an act of bad faith, he had made a binding obligation with the Imperial Government and British Columbia, that a certain work should be constructed in a certain time. It was impossible to proceed with the work at all if the resolution were passed. I can show the House that the Government of the day are, in the face of that resolution, violating the constitution by spending one dollar in connection with the railway. What was the state of things when the resolution was passed? It was this: three millions of additional taxes had been levied on the Canadian people, as the hon. the Minister of Justice had stated in one of his speeches; that British Columbia had nothing to complain of, for Parliament had provided three millions of additional taxes for the purpose of constructing the road. The money was all gone, and to say that under these circumstances the Government should not be permitted to spend that vote until they had accepted that resolution, was to say that they should not spend another dollar in connection with the railway. The hon. the First Minister was bound to have thrown himself on the House, not on one side but on both sides, and to have said: "The good faith not of the Government alone, but of Canada, was pledged by the head of the Government to carry

out the railway, and I call on the House to vote down the motion." It is said that the resolution was drafted by a Minister and offered by a Minister to another gentleman in this House a month before, and he refused to move it, and that resolution, moved by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was voted for by the Government and all their supporters; and when they did that, they placed themselves in a position from which, I believe, with all their ability and special pleading, they will find it difficult to extricate themselves when arraigned by British Columbia, or by the Colonial Minister, or any person in this country, on the serious charge of having been guilty of bad faith in relation to this matter.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER resumed his speech. He said: When the House rose for recess, I was dealing with the position in which the Government were placed by the resolution passed at the close of the last Session, and I had taken the ground that any expenditure made since the passage of that resolution by the Government was not only unconstitutional but illegal—that, in fact, they were bound by the resolution to stop at once any expenditure upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. The resolution which I read provided that the vote for the construction of the road should only be given to them under the obligation that no portion of it could be expended which would involve increasing the existing rate of taxation. Now, what was the position in which the hon. gentlemen found themselves placed the moment that resolution was placed upon the Journals of this House? Three millions of new additional taxation had been imposed upon the people of Canada, and, which was admitted by one of the hon. Ministers to be mainly for the purpose of constructing the railway. Parliament met, and the Government were obliged to admit, as the hon. the Minister of Finance has admitted, during the present Session, that he went to England to negotiate the late loan last autumn because it was known that a large deficit existed. Now, the Government have admitted this Session that the deficit was about $2,000,000, that the $2,000,000 of additional taxation which was imposed was all expended, and that that being done the ordinary expenditure of the country exceeded the whole revenue by $1,900,000; and, as an examination of the figures shows, the hon. the Minister of Finance considerably understated the amount of the deficit which existed. The Government have asked the House to impose $500,000 of additional taxation this year in order to meet the expenditure of the year over the amount which the $3,000,000 of previous taxes had enabled them to meet. Under these circumstances, I want to know if this resolution is not waste paper, what it means. I want to know how the Government can, without violating the principle of Parliamentary Government, expend a single dollar of public money for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad with the admission of the hon. the Finance Minister that the taxation of the country was increased, must be increased, and that additional taxes must be imposed in order to meet this expenditure—that he was unable to meet the existing cost upon the revenue without new taxation. I say they were completly prohibited and precluded from the expenditure of a single dollar without the violation of the constitution. I have another very grave charge to make against the Administration in relation to this work. Every person who has given the subject any attention knows that, regard it from what point of view you may, the moment you have declared the expediency of constructing the Pacific Railway, the moment you have gone the length that the hon. the First Minister has gone in admitting its absolute necessity, that moment you are bound to adopt every possible means in your power in order to promote the construction of that road. What means have the Government adopted? I shall show the House that from the moment they were placed in the responsible position they occupy, they had steadily, persistently, and enormously exagger-

ated the cost of that work. And what would be the effect of that? The effect of exaggerating the cost would be to prevent any capitalist at home or abroad from investing a dollar, and to compel the Government of the country to find all the money required to be invested in the work. And if I can show the House, as I am confident that I can, that they have steadily exaggerated and done all that they possibly could, in the high positions which they occupy, to deter any person from assisting in the construction of that work, and damaged the financial position of the country by declaring that it had assumed an obligation to construct a work enormous in its cost and unproductive in its results, I think I will show that the Government have pursued a course the most inimical to the interests of the country that can be conceived. The hon. the First Minister gave a proper answer to a question which I put across the floor of the House last night. I asked the estimated cost of the Pacific Railway, and the hon. gentleman gave us some very interesting, and, I may frankly say, some encouraging statements as to the cost of the work. In order to draw out a statement which would be still more encouraging, I asked what the estimate was. His answer was judicious and proper. It was to the effect, that in the position that he occupied, and in relation to the fact that they were about to ask for tenders at no distant day, it would perhaps be unwise for him to commit himself to a statement as to the expenditure it would involve. I regret that that wise and judicious policy was not always pursued by that hon. gentleman. I need not go back to the period of the general election, when the country was made to ring with the most exaggerated statements of the cost of this work, and the intolerable, or to use the expressive language of the hon. the Minister of Justice since he became a member of the Government, the "dreadful burden" that was upon the country. The statements to the country have been precisely of that character, and coming from persons in the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite, rendered it impossible to draw a dollar of money into the service of the country in connection with this work. Now the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in the most authentic manner, over his own signature, in a well and carefully considered manifesto at the general election, estimated the cost of 1,300 miles, of certainly not the most difficult portion, at from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000—no portion of this was in the Rocky Mountains of British Columbia. He stated, as I have said, that he proposed to avoid the construction of 1,300 miles of this road, some 600 miles of it from Lake Nepigon and the remaining 700 along the water stretches of the Saskatchewan, saving to the country and avoiding for the present the construction of about 1,300 miles of railway, which was estimated to cost from sixty to eighty millions of dollars. Now, Sir, if 1,300 miles of this road---and certainly not the most difficult portion of it, for we all recognized as being the great difficulty, the line permeating the Cascade range and the Rocky Mountains---would cost from sixty to eighty millions of dollars, I would ask what estimate commercial men, intelligent men and capitalists would form of the amount of money that would be required to construct this 2,000 miles from the Pacific to Lake Superior. Well, Sir, we have that followed up by the statement, quite as authentic, and on a financial question quite as weighty, published as we knew, broadcast, and sent to every part of the country, and not only here, but in Great Britain, by the Hon. Minister of Finance. Some comment I believe, Sir, has been made with reference to the expenditure involved in the publication of the Budget Speeches of the Minister of Finance; but, Sir, I do not intend to raise any question as to the propriety of a document so important as that being widely spread over the country, though I will ask for what reason should you spend a great deal of money when you have a great work like the Canadian Pacific Railway in hand,—in sending abroad and in Great Britain a statement such as that which I am now going to read on this subject from the Budget Speech in 1874, of the Minister of Finance. He said, following up the authentic statement of the First Minister:—

"In order rightly to understand the real nature and extent of the burden we would be required to take upon ourselves, it must be remembered that the lowest estimate for building this road to the Pacific is something over one hundred millions of dollars, and this too on the supposition that a very much longer time would be given for the construction."

"I entertain no doubt that if it were incumbent upon us to push the line through within the time specified (if this were possible), the expense would be enormously increased, and that a moderate estimate would reach one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty millions of dollars. Every hon. gentleman who has had experience in these matters know that the cost of construction of a work of this kind is largely enhanced if it be required to carry it to completion in a certain limited time. They well knew, too, that there is great difficulty in carrying such a work through an unprotected country, much of which, looking particularly at two sections of it, is a desert, at least for arable purposes."

"Were we to undertake such a burden as this, I would simply say that our national debt in seven years would be, relatively to our population, just one-third greater than that with which the United States emerged from their great civil war, and, if measured by the rate of interest required, it would be one-third greater than the huge national debt of England."

Now, Sir, the First Minister stated in his manifesto to the country that he hoped, in connection with this work, to be able to attract an immense amount of immigration to the country, and every person who knows anything of this question, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, knows that one of the most important features in connection with it is the opportunity its construction would present of bringing a great mass of immigrants into this country; and how admirably are these words of the Finance Minister calculated to bring people into Canada when people throughout the world are told, from so high and so authentic a source as the Minister of Finance of the Government of Canada, that the debt of this country is to become greater than that of the United States when emerging from the civil war, and one-third greater than that of England. In other words he goes on to say:—

"That if we undertake to fulfill this project according to the letter of the law, the burden we would require to ask you to lay upon yourselves for this purpose alone would be equal to a new debt of seven hundred and fifty millions sterling imposed on the people of England."

He is determined, Sir, that they shall understand the enormous taxes they will have to pay if they venture to come into Canada. He continues:—

"Having regard to population and the rates of interest we would respectively have to pay, for this is an important consideration, were it the pleasure of the House to decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be completed in that time, it must also be prepared to take into account the sums required to be borrowed for other public works, and to redeem certain portions of the public debt; and, at a moderate estimate, over $200,000,000 would be needed for all purposes. In other words, we would be compelled to go to the London market—for this is the only market practically open to us—as borrowers of $30,000,000 every year for seven successive years. There may be hon. gentlemen in this House who think we would be able to do this; but, if so, I envy them their faith in the future of the Dominion. Now, Sir, I say that such a project, involving such a charge is ludicrously absurd."

Then, Sir, he returned to the subject, and he said:—

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I spoke before the recess at some length upon the extraordinary deficiency arising from the working of the Intercolonial Railway and the other railroads of the Dominion, chiefly in the Maritime Provinces. The deficiencies arising from these sources are reported as likely to amount to the extraordinary sum of about a million and a quarter dollars. I desire to call the special attention of the House to one point which must be clear to every hon. gentleman These railways ran for the most part through a country which has been settled for the last fifty or sixty years. I cannot refer, of course, to the fact that these railroads entail such an enormous expenditure, without its becoming apparent to the House, that the cost of the maintenance of a railway, nearly 3,000 miles in length, and passing through a country which is almost entirely uninhabited, must be of necessity very much greater. For a very long time, even after the actual construction of this railway, an enormous charge must be levied upon this country in order to keep it in full working order and repair, and this fact must be steadily kept sight of in considering the real character of the project."

So much, Sir, for the manner in which the Minister of Finance endorsed the statements of the First Minister; of course, they are qualified to a certain extent by his speaking of the effect of the construction of that road within a certain time, but the hon. gentleman applied no such limitation to this estimate. He says that the lowest estimate is one hundred millions and yet, Sir, strange to say, these gentlemen—I will not say with madness or with recklessness to use the strictly parliamentary expressions of the First Minister because I wish to confine myself to extremely moderate terms in characterising the acts of the hon. gentlemen opposite; I will not use any of these terms, although having such

an authority for them, in connection with this subject, they naturally rise to one's lips; but I do say that these statements were not, in my judgment, calculated to promote the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, either by a company or by the Government. In the first place, they would be calculated, in the mind of every commercial man and capitalist abroad, to lead to the conclusion that the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway was one of the maddest and most unquestionable measures that any Government or party ever engaged in; and in the second place, they would lead to the conclusion that the Government that were saddling a country with such a liability, and had undertaken to carry out such an obligation, would be in a position that would render their credit at no distant day, a very doubtful matter. I have given you the statement over the signature of the First Minister and his manifesto to the country; and the endorsement of that by, and the statements of, the Minister of Finance; then, Sir, we come to the introduction of the Act, and hon. gentlemen will remember—because the subject was too important rapidly to fade from recollection—that when the First Minister went, as he was bound to do, into a very exhaustive explanation of what the cost of this work would be, he drew his illustrations from a variety of sources, as to what railways cost in other places, and showed that railways running through a prairie country cost not less than $48,000 a mile. He told us what the Intercolonial was costing, and he led the House and country to believe that, in his estimate of 1,300 miles, costing from $60,000 to $80,000, he was not very far astray. He stated that the country must find all the money. That the project was so hopeless as a commercial undertaking that it was simple madness to look for any assistance from capitalists, and that the people of the country must make up their minds to bear the burden themselves, without any aid from capitalists. He favoured the House with an estimate of the working expenses. He showed that the life of an iron rail was only eight years, a steel rail however lasting some years longer. He undertook to show that when the road was in working order it was hopeless to expect anything like fair returns until millions of people were thrown into the North-West; and he estimated that there would be an annual deficit on the working expense of $6,000,000 per annum. This was the view hon. gentlemen were putting forward to the country at the very time they were taking power to construct the whole of the road as a Government road, and making a solemn engagement to construct, in 13 years from the present date, some 2,000 miles, and that embracing some of the most difficult portions of the road. I am charging the Government with doing that which, if they could be justly charged with, certainly shows an amount of incapacity in dealing with this matter which was extraordinary. I say that the Government were bound to present it in the most favourable light to the country, especially if they had the most remote idea that the time would come when they would invite capitalists to tender for its construction. Last night the hon. the First Minister gave us the information that 228 miles of the railway from Thunder Bay to English River, and from Selkirk to Keewatin, would be completed and fairly equipped with rolling stock at something like $24,500 per mile, and that 65 miles from Pembina to Fort Garry had been graded at a cost of $3,500 per mile, and that this latter amount was to be considered as something like a fair estimate of the prairie sections.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, no.

Mr. TUPPER: I suppose then that the hon. gentleman intended to confine his estimate to completing the line from Fort Garry to Selkirk?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. TUPPER: I understood the hon. gentleman to apply that estimate to the whole of the prairie section. But the country must be exceptionally favourable in that part of the route.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Of course it is.

Mr. TUPPER: But I am certain the House heard with pleasure the hon. gentleman state the amount

of money which practical experience had shown the road could be constructed for, and I would like to ask him, in the light of the experience he has had, whether he is not prepared to revise his statement as to the "insanity" of building the road on a subsidy of $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of the finest land on which the sun shines on in any part of the world. (Hon. gentlemen: Oh! oh!) Yes, I say you can select by the Pacific Railway Act 50,000,000 acres of the finest land in the world upon which the sun shines. Nothing on the face of the civilized world exceeds it in fertility, and as a grain and grazing country; and I do not think that the hon. the First Minister will be prepared to controvert that statement. At Whitby, in the Riding of South Ontario, the hon. gentleman said we might as well offer $10 to build the road as $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land. This was the language by an hon. gentleman whose every word was weighed, as he now seemed to appreciate. After spending three years in denouncing this undertaking, and exaggerating in every possible and conceivable manner the cost of this work, diminished as had been "the dreadful burden" by the interposition of the Minister of Justice, the *finale* was, that the hon. gentleman was, at the moment he was making the above remarks at Whitby, publishing a notice to capitalists and contractors to be prepared on the 1st January, 1877, to tender for the construction of this road. After undertaking the work as a Government work, and spending large amount of money upon it as such, in constructing some of the least productive portions of the road, after having exhausted all the power the Government possessed, in pointing out the utter impossibility of any person touching this matter, without being involved in the most utter financial ruin, he caps the climax by, adopting the policy of the late Government, publishing notices for tenders to contractors upon the basis of $10,000 and 20,000 acres of land per mile, or at the rate of $27,000,000 and 50,000,000 of acres of land, and asks the amount they will take, in addition to that, to build and own and operate the road. The hon. gentleman mentioned last night to the House, he took us into his confidence so far as to say that there had not much result obtained from that advertisement, that the capitalists of the world did not seem in a hurry to invest their money or their means in the construction of a Pacific Railway for Canada. Is it any wonder, after three years spent by this Government in exaggerating, as the hon. gentleman proved last night, in enormously exaggerating the cost that would be involved by the construction of this work; that when he comes back at last to the policy of his predecessors, the hon. the First Minister finds that what capitalists were eagerly prepared to engage in at a former period, they now shrink from touching. The statements of the hon. the Minister of Finance that this 3,000 miles of unpeopled country, that two sections of this road are two great Saharas, two great deserts from which nothing is to be hoped, could not certainly be expected to cause a great rush of capitalists to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Government stands to-day charged before the people of Canada with having failed in their duty to the people in their dealing with this question after they had voluntarily assumed this obligation. Instead of saying: "The late Government engaged to give $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land to any capitalists who were prepared to construct this road; we are prepared to do that, and to act in good faith, to go thus far but not beyond it," they maintained that it was incumbent upon them to assume that they must carry the work to completion, although they did it with public money and as a public work. I have already told the House that the Government have undertaken to do this under the Railway Act, providing that it should be constructed as under the Public Works Act. It is not to be done by Commissioners, but directly by the Minister of Public Works. I now pass from the general question of the policy of the Government in relation to this matter to the course they have pursued in carrying out that policy. Before going further, I desire to remind the House that these gentlemen were not free to deal in the autocratic matter,

regardless of parliamentary control and popular opinion, that they seem to have imagined and that they certainly have practised. When they were seeking to obtain power, they gave the people of this country to understand the principles which would govern them after they attained power, and prominent among those principles was that which was stated by the Prime Minister in a speech delivered on the 5th July, 1872, in Montreal, the commercial capital of the Dominion. He said :

"The policy of the Liberal Party is to make the parliamentary government supreme, to place the Cabinet directly under the control of Parliament, to take from them all power to use any part of the people's money without a direct vote for each service. I might point out, as an instance of the course the Liberal Party will pursue, that in Ontario, when the Reform Government came into power, they repealed a portion of the Act granting aid to railways, so that all grants had to receive the sanction of the House before a farthing could be paid."

I could multiply instances in which the hon. gentleman pledged himself to the same principle, and promised that if he was entrusted with the management of public affairs, "parliamentary government should be supreme," and that no public money should be touched without a direct vote for the purpose. Let us see how, in carrying the law out, the hon. gentleman has succeeded. I may say, further, that, when he introduced the act giving him power to construct this road in the Department of Public Works as a government work, the hon. gentleman renewed the pledge, and told the House that, if they passed the Act—as will be seen by the report of his speech in the Toronto *Globe* newspaper—not a single cent of the people's money should be expended except after a direct vote for the purpose. And, Sir, the House will remember that one of the leading features of the Act was, that no work should be performed on it except under contracts, and that these contracts must be given by public tender. I now come to a very unpleasant feature in connection with the administration of this great question, and that is to the purchase of steel rails; and, I may say at once, that, consistently with what I stated when I rose to-night that I would endeavour to avoid touching any question that would, in the least degree, lead the House away from the mode in which the Government had dealt with the question, I shall, on the present occasion, carefully abstain from touching anything in reference to this matter except its purely business features, as a transaction for which the House have a right to hold the Ministry directly responsible. Now, the hon. gentleman has brought down a statement of the cost of the steel rails which were purchased without a vote of a dollar being passed by this House. It has been said elsewhere that there was a vote, that before the money was paid a vote was taken. The hon. gentleman knows it is trifling with the intelligence of the country, and I believe I am correct in saying it has never been attempted so to trifle with the intelligence of Parliament as to draw a distinction between a binding contract being made by the Government of Canada, not subject to the vote of Parliament, and the money being paid. The fact that the tenders and the contracts were laid upon the table of the House before the money was paid does not touch the question at all. Had the contracts been made subject to the approval of Parliament, there might have been a difference; but they were absolute, leaving no option to Parliament, without being charged with bad faith in not carrying out an arrangemade by the Government of Canada, and that is an alternative which I am sure the hon. gentleman would not say left it open to the House at all. The hon. gentleman, who had pledged himself that parliamentary government should be supreme; that, if we passed the Act, not a cent should be spent without a vote, startled the House and the country by the statement that he had made contracts, binding contracts on the Government, for the purchase of 50,000 tons of steel rails. We have now ascertained something like the cost of the rails delivered in the country. The return shows the dates of the payments that were made and the charges that were made upon them. I have had the interest carefully calculated. I find, by the return brought down by the Government, that $2,925,896 was paid for these rails, delivered in Canada, including the

cost of freight and the inspection. The interest on that sum at 5 per cent. would of course be $146,294. And the meantime at which that interest became payable—because those amounts of money were paid at different dates—but the meantime at which the whole interest became payable was the 5th November, 1875. So that from that moment we have been paying interest amounting, at 5 per cent., to $146,294 per annum. On the 5th day of May, which will be here in a very few days, we will have a year and a half's interest accumulated, $219,441. To show the price to which rails have since fallen—I may say that I was prepared to produce testimony of an authentic character on this question, and would have done so if it had been convenient to call the Committee on Public Accounts together—I speak on the authority of a gentleman well qualified to judge, who had made a purchase of steel rails of the best quality, and had them delivered at Prescott Junction during the past year, at a cost of £7 15s. sterling—that is $37.71 per ton. The freight from Montreal to Prescott I assume to be, and I am told it is within the mark, $1.71. Deduct that, and you have the cost of the best steel rails that can be made, and by parties who were ready to supply any quantity of rails upon the same terms, at about $36 per ton, laid down in Montreal. Now, the House will see that 50,000 tons of steel rails and fastenings, laid down in Montreal, cost us, according to the return laid upon the table of the House by the hon. the First Minister himself, $2,925,896, and the price at which the same description of rails were laid down at Montreal, within the last six months, was $36 per ton, The cost, therefore, of the 50,000 tons, if purchased within the past six months, instead of when they were purchased, in 1874, and paid for at a mean date of November 5, 1875, and from which date we have been paying interest on the whole sum, would have been $1,800,000, showing a dead loss on the cost of the rails, compared with what the same quality could be purchased to-day, of nearly a million dollars. Now, add to that the interest payable before they can be used, and the dead loss to the country in relation to that transaction alone, will exceed a million and a half dollars. I do not, as I said before, intend to touch any question outside the purely business nature of this transaction, because I have abundant ground for the motion I am submitting to the House without introducing any collateral issue; but I must call attention to the fact that, in relation to a part of this purchase, no tenders appear to have been asked. I notice that 5,000 tons were bought without tender, and the freight to Vancouver Island seems to have been arranged on the same private principle and not by tender. This bears on the point I am charging against the Government, that they have systematically violated the binding obligation of the law, and their own repeated pledges, that everything should be done by contract in relation to those works. The charge of $223,884 for inland transportation must be a mistake, and for this reason: We are told by the Public Accounts, we have been told by the speech of the hon. the First Minister, that it cost $15 per ton to convey the rails from Duluth to St. Boniface, near Fort Garry. The public documents on the table show that nearly 13,000 tons of rails have been deposited there, and the House will see at once that on that transaction, carrying these rails that portion of the distance by the Red River Transportation Co., must be something in the neighbourhood of $200,000. I am told that was not done by public tender and contract. Now, Sir, what was the necessity of buying these rails at all. Why should they be purchased? What did the Government want with 50,000 tons of steel rails? We have, in a public document laid on the table of the House, a statement as to the condition in which the Pacific Railway works were at that date; and what do they show? Why, Sir, they show that the contract was made for the first section, from Fort William to Sunshine Creek, a distance of 32½ miles—the line ran originally from Fort William to Shebandowan, but it was afterwards altered—on April the 3rd, 1875; nearly six months after the purchase of these 50,000 tons of steel rails was made, the

first contract requiring their use was entered into; and, Sir, we are told that on the 1st of January, 1877, more than two years after this purchase was made, that 25½ miles, requiring 2,295 tons of the 50,000 are used; and therefore that is all of these 50,000 tons of steel rails purchased at a cost of nearly $3,000,000 involving an interest of over $140,000 per annum, which, at the end of this period, these hon. gentlemen with all their anxiety—and I have no doubt that they have pressed these works forward, for they had reason to press them forward as far as it was possible to do so, for the purpose of getting these rails out of sight—yet, with all their efforts, all they have been able to accomplish has been to use 2,295 tons of rails, and that, too, not on a portion of the Pacific Railway, but on a branch, unauthorized by Parliament, and built without the sanction of Parliament or the vote of Parliament. Also, on April 3rd, 1875, they made a contract, from Selkirk to Cross Lake, 77 miles; and on the 7th of June, 1876, they made a contract from Sunshine Creek to English River, 80 miles more. As to both of these contracts, the first have the same date, April 3rd, 1875, from Fort William to Sunshine Creek; and April 3rd, from Selkirk to Cross Lake, 77 miles; and, on the 7th June, 1876, with all the despatch and every effort they could make, they were enabled to put 80 miles more under contract, from Sunshine Creek to English River; and on the 9th of January, 1877, from Cross Lake to Keewatin, so that, at this moment, there are 226 miles under contract, 37 miles of which were put under contract this year, and 80 miles of it only on the 7th of June last; yet, Sir, we have the purchase made, as I say, in November 1874, of no less than three million of dollars worth of steel rails, or 50,000 tons. Now, Sir, I may be told,—but you have failed to credit us with 11,160 tons for the Intercolonial Railway—but I would like to know how they came on the Intercolonial Railway. I stand in the presence of Parliament and I am open to correction, and I ask the attention of my hon. friend from Chateauguay to the point which I am about to make, when I say that there is no graver violation of constitutional law—there is no graver violation of Parliamentary principle, than the appropriation of the public money, voted for one object, to another; I am open to the correction of the House, if I am right or wrong in that statement; and I say that the Government that would dare to take public money voted for one purpose and apply it to another a thousand miles away from the place for which it was voted, and for which Parliament gave the vote, has violated the Constitution and ignored the fundamental principles of parliamentary Government. I say that the power that Parliament has over the Government of the day, is that sound constitutional maxim which deprives the Government of the power of spending money unless they have the authority of the House for it. I say that grant the principle that you can take 11,000 tons of rails, bought for the Canadian Pacific Railway with a vote for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and take them away and put them to another purpose totally different, and I say that the Government can carry on the government of the country despite the power of Parliament, because it can use any vote for the Canadian Pacific Railway for the ordinary expenses of the country, or for the payment of their own salaries, or for anything of that kind—I am giving perhaps, an extreme illustration, but it is because I want to draw the attention of the House to the matter. It appears that the First Minister, who claimed the confidence of the people over and above all men in this country, because he was going to carry out the principle of parliamentary Government, has become totally oblivious to his duty to the House and his duty to the country in reference to the expenditure of public money. I ask the House if we have ever been asked to authorise a change of that appropriation? I ask the House if any authority was ever given by it to the Government to change a dollar of that appropriation for the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Intercolonial Railway? I am open to the correction, but I am not aware, and I do not believe, that the Government have ever considered it to be their duty to ask Parliament to grant any such authority. If it has

not, then I say, Sir, that one of the gravest charges made in connection with this whole transaction, and which stands against these hon. gentlemen, is undertaking to so deal with public moneys, and appropriating public moneys for purposes for which it was never intended by Parliament and never voted. I wish also to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman purchased these rails in a falling market. He may say: "I had no knowledge of that," but he cannot say that, because I have under my hand the advice given to him by a gentleman well conversant with these questions, and a gentleman in whom that hon gentleman has great confidence, in every possible way, of which he has given evidence to the House—I mean, Sir, the Superintendent of the Provincial Railways, Mr. Brydges—made a report to that hon. gentleman, and he used these very significant terms; and this was on the 31st day of October, 1874, at the time when this subject was under consideration. He says, in a letter addressed to Hon. A. Mackenzie, dated 31st October, 1874:—

"There is no doubt whatever, that at the close of 1873 and the beginning of 1874, the steel rail market in England was well known to be in a declining condition, and no prudent man would buy rails at that time unless he actually wanted them for immediate delivery."

Now, Sir, I do not, as I dare say the House knows, always regard that gentleman as a supreme authority. I believe this is pretty well understood; but, I do say that it is not open to the hon. gentleman who leads the House, to take that position because he has confidence in him. He has shown it in every possible way, that one man can show that he has confidence in an individual; and he knew that Mr. Brydges was conversant with this whole question, and he had under his hand that letter at the very time he was entering upon this purchase. Now, Sir, what answer does the hon. gentleman give to the House when he is charged with taking three millions of the public money without the authority of Parliament, and without one dollar of it being voted, and making a binding contract for its expenditure for 50,000 tons of steel rails, which, at the end of this long period of time, he admits himself it is impossible to apply, and he gives no prospect to the House of being able to use them for long years to come. I have shown the dates when these contracts, which are now under construction, were let, and you know the difficulty of going through a large portion of the country in question, and its remoteness from supplies; and I have shown that with all the public money the Government could spend, and all the pressure the Government could bring to bear, as the Minister of Finance says, in an open and settled country, it has taken seven long years to accomplish the construction of the Intercolonial Railway; and hon. gentlemen will see what time must elapse before it could be possible to use 50,000 tons of rails on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Sir, the Leader of the Ministerialists, a member of the Government in the Upper Branch, says they only expect to be able to get the road through from Thunder Bay to Red River in seven or eight years; and the hon. the Finance Minister admitted last night, or, at all events, recently, that it must be at least four or five years before that portion of the road can be made. And yet these rails are lying and rusting and deteriorating in value quite as much as if they were moderately used.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. TUPPER: I may be wrong, and I am open to correction. But if it is nonsense, it is nonsense shared in by nearly all experts connected with railway matters in the world. This question of the oxidization of rails had attracted the attention of scientific men generally. It has attracted the attention of scientific men, who had devoted their whole life and great abilities to the question of railways, and there was no more interesting question than this of the oxidation of rails. Some attributed the protection from oxidation to a certain amount of electrical action caused by the passage of the cars over the rails, others held that when the rails were piled up the wet accumulated and the rust was more rapid than otherwise. But the fact remained that rails deteri-

orated more rapidly when piled up than when moderately used.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would the hon. gentleman name any of these experts.

Mr. TUPPER: I did not suppose that a fact so generally known would be contravened. But I will undertake to look up for the hon. gentleman a very elaborate statement on the subject, which, I trust, will satisfy him. I hear an hon. friend saying that "If the rust don't eat them up the interest will."

Mr. DYMOND: Would the hon. gentleman be able to give us his authorities before he asks us to vote for his motion.

Mr. TUPPER: I think I shall be able to convince, if not to convert, even such an incorrigible supporter of the other side as the hon. member for North York, without my being able to quote that specific authority upon that point; and will give an opportunity to the hon. gentleman to show his independent position. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Fleming advised him. I have no hesitation in saying that I consider the authority of the Chief Engineer, on a great many questions connected with such a work, as quite sufficient to absolve the Minister of Public Works, whoever he may be, from any blame whatever. If the hon. gentleman can show one single line signed by Sandford Fleming, to him, stating that at a certain time the road would be in such a state of forwardness as to require a certain amount of rails, however mistaken Mr. Fleming may be, I will at once acquit the First Minister of any blame in the transaction, because he would give the House an authority which any reasonable man would be satisfied with. But I deny that Mr. Fleming is a special authority on this question. There are ten thousand men in this country just as able, and thousands of them more able, to advise the First Minister in relation to a purely commercial and business question, than Mr. Fleming, with all his engineering knowledge. If it was a question in which the hon. gentleman had required Mr. Fleming's professional knowledge, I should say his opinion was sufficient. But we have to remember that all the authority brought here from Mr. Fleming furnished was after the transaction was over. And this authority was given incidentally and verbally. This was only a paltry matter of 50,000 tons of rails, an insignificant matter of $3,000,000, and it was not considered worth a sheet of paper to make a report upon. In passing, the First Minister asked Mr. Fleming, verbally, whether it would be a good thing to secure a large quantity of steel rails.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I never asked anything of the kind.

Mr. TUPPER: So much the worse. Then the hon. gentleman has no right to quote Mr. Fleming on the subject as an authority. But supposing Mr. Fleming had given him, in writing, the most elaborate report, which, however, he did not give, I question the propriety of the hon. gentleman procuring an *exparte* statement for the purpose of justifying an action for which he himself was responsible. I do not presume to question the strict accuracy of every statement of Mr. Fleming, but I claim that the Government ought not to require from a subordinate officer, however high his position, a justification of acts of which they were responsible themselves alone to Parliament, unless they show that prior to the Act, they had some evidence, in writing, as to the necessity of the transaction. But who would suspect that the First Minister would have justified a transaction of this kind by quoting Mr. Fleming. I can show that he has no confidence in Mr. Fleming's judgment, even in a question where engineering entered largely into consideration. On a question on which he had devoted years of his life, and had expended enormous sums of public money, the hon. the First Minister had treated the report of Mr. Fleming as unworthy the paper on which it was written. A great deal of controversy had arisen in respect to the route of the Intercolonial Railway. Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Government appointed Mr. Fleming to make an exhaustive survey for the purpose of locating the line of the Intercolonial Railway. That duty was vigorously discharged for years; and afterwards Mr. Fleming was called upon to give his advice. He says on page 84, in a work published by the First Minister and paid for by the country, I presume:

"When Mr. Fleming entered upon the survey in 1864, his instructions on this point were very plain. He was not called upon to select what he held to be the most eligible line; indeed, as he read his instructions, he considered it to be his duty to withhold all indications of preference. His own opinions were, however, explicitly and directly expressed, when it became his duty to place them on record. In March, 1868, he was requested by the Government to report on the route he held to be the best. * * * The Chief Engineer, after examining the arguments advanced in favour of each route, placed on record his opinion that, beyond a doubt, the line by the Bay of Chaleurs was the route to be adopted."

And yet, after that declaration, made in a way to carry all the weight of authority Mr. Fleming could throw into any document, the hon. the First Minister treated it then as he treats it now, as so much waste paper, and said that the Government were throwing $8,000,000 into the sea in adopting the route that the Chief Engineer, after surveying five years, and, when called upon to express his opinion deliberately declared was infinitely the best.

Mr. MILLS: It was your colleague, Mr. Macdougall.

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Macdougall was never my colleague. I had not that honour. If the honour of the originality of the expression is to be attributed to Mr. Macdougall he has been most servilely copied by a good many hon. gentlemen opposite, with the fact before them that Mr. Fleming had made a report in the most authoritative manner in which it could be made, in favour of that route; and this on a question on which his opinion was certainly entitled to respect. The hon. gentleman has not shown that he consulted any commercial men, though there were some of his friends engaged in the trade, whose disinterested advice, if taken, would have pointed to the fact, as I showed in the House when the transaction was first announced, that an enormous public loss was going to occur to the country in consequence of that ill-advised purchase. We have now the fact that this country is to be saddled with that enormous burden, that the legacy, the monument which the hon. the First Minister would leave behind him, when I trust, at an early day, his monument as Prime Minister will be erected, would be that transaction by which not less than $75,000 annually for ever out of the public purse was lost to the people. I ask the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond), unbelieving as he is, if that is not sufficient ground, without being able to give the authority of an expert, that rails become oxidized by lying on the ground unused, to warrant any independent member in saying that the hon. gentleman has violated the first principles of parliamentary government by expending that money without the authority of the House, and, owing to this ill-advised and unfortunate purchase, he has sunk over a million and a half of dollars of the people's money, never to be recovered, involving an annual charge of $75,000 on the public treasury. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to leave so unpleasant a subject, because I feel that I cannot deal with it, that I cannot discharge my duty to this House and the country temperately, as I am endeavouring to discharge it, without reflecting not only upon the hon. the First Minister, but upon the Parliament of Canada and the people of this country. I will exculpate the people because, until they have the opportunity of passing their own verdict upon it, we must absolve them from blame, but this Parliament stands before the world and the people of this country as prepared to sustain a Prime Minister who forgets what he owes to Parliament, to his own public declarations and to the laws on the Statute-book in this transaction, independent of the enormous amount of pecuniary loss which has been entailed. I now come to another matter in which the law has been violated in the most direct and glaring manner. I speak of the expenditure of money for the Canada Pacific Railway telegraph. The law provided that a line of electric telegraph shall be constructed in advance of the said railway and branches along the whole extent so soon as practicable after the location of the line should be determined upon. No law could be more easy of construction. It did not require an appeal to the Minister of Justice of the day, the predecessor of the present Minister (we know what his construction of the law would have been), it did not require a reference to

any legal mind to say what the construction of that law was. It became my duty to bring this subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph before the House when, in 1875, the hon. the Premier again, in his truly autocratic fashion, stated to the House that he had entered into contracts to the extent of over $700,000 for the construction of that telegraph line. I directed the attention of the House to the illegality of the proceedings; I challenged the propriety of this work being so carried out, and claimed that it could not be done under the law. My action was followed up by my late lamented friend, Mr. Hillyard Cameron, the member for Cardwell, who joined in that opinion, and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) followed by moving a resolution condemning the act as illegal, which was seconded, I think, by the hon. member for Cardwell. The House will remember the short discussion which took place on that occasion, to which I intend briefly to call the attention of the hon. the First Minister. I may state that on November 10th, 1874, a contract was made with Mr. F. Barnard to construct a telegraph line from Cache Creek to Edmonton, 550 miles. That contract required the telegraph to be completed on October 2nd, 1876, and yet, on April 20th, 1877, the hon. the First Minister in his place in this House last night, admitted that he did not know within one hundred or two hundred miles of that point where the Canadian Pacific Railway would go. Yet he made a contract, knowing that he had not a particle of authority in law or a vote from Parliament, to spend one dollar on the construction of a mile of telegraph, except as the railway line may have been located; nevertheless, he made a binding contract with Mr. Barnard, to construct 550 miles of telegraph from Edmonton to Cache Creek, which, according to the hon. gentleman's statement last night, would not be within 200 miles of the point where it is most probable the railway will go.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not say a word about that.

Mr. TUPPER: I am open to correction if Fort George is not between 100 and 200 miles from Cache Creek.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not say that the road would go to Fort George.

Mr. TUPPER: No. But I will show the hon. gentleman and the House that he had decided that it should go to Fort George; that after the matter was discussed in the House, that after the vote was taken as to the illegality of the proceedings, the present Minister of Justice, the Minister of the Interior and Mr. Justice Moss having refused to vote with the hon. gentleman, that it was not illegal when attacked in his most vital part—those gentleman, including two of the most able legal minds in the House, refused to support him. A few days afterwards the hon. the First Minister telegraphed to Mr. Bernard to stop work, and he endeavoured to transfer the construction of the telegraph from Edmonton to Cache Creek to Fort George, showing he had then decided that was to be the railway line. The contract was not merely for the construction of a telegrhph; it was for to aid the construction of a railway as well, because it was given out by the hon. gentleman in his statement in the House that he had contracted with the telegraph constructor to clear the road for 132 feet, which would be so much work done towards the construction of the road itself. Yet all this was done, when the hon. gentleman, according to his own statement last night, confessed he did not know within 200 miles where the road was to be. The hon. gentleman was very much mistaken in the statements he made to the House on that occasion. I will not say more than that, because I do not wish to be supposed to bring a charge of wilful misstatement against the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Of course not.

Mr. TUPPER: If I did wish to give it an unpleasant turn, I could submit a great deal of authority for the statement I will lay before the House. I do not wish, however, to be so understood. I know the hon. gentleman's mind is burdened with an enormous amount of work, and one of the reasons why he has so signally failed in administering the important

department of Public Works is because the hon. gentleman is altogether overweighted in undertaking that which no man, however great his powers can discharge, viz: to fill the position of of Premier with efficiency and vigour, and at the same time discharge the laborious and almost overwhelming duties devolving upon any Minister of Public Works. I feel on this, as on other occasions, that the hon. the First Minister cannot carry in his mind all the statements necessary in order to meet charges which may be brought against his Ministry. To-day it is our duty to bring charges against hon. gentlemen opposite. To morrow, no distant to-morrow, I believe, it will be their duty to criticise our acts, and I trust, when the time comes, that we will be judged in the same lenient and kindly spirit in which I have endeavoured to judge the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. Well, Sir, the question arose, and it was charged that this contract was made and that the telegraph was being constructed contrary to law, without the authority of law, and in opposition to the Act, because no line had been located. On page 1013 of *Hansard* of 1875, I find the following:

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the line had been located where the contracts had been let, and he conceived the Government were acting according to law."

I have shown that this contract was let to a point that the hon. gentleman was unable to tell us whether it was on the line or within 200 miles of it; and that is six months after the time fixed for the completion of the contract.

An HON. MEMBER: There is no contract let.

Mr. TUPPER: No, not for the railway; the line is not located. The report proceeds:

"Mr. SCHULTZ said the only portion of the work that had been done was that under contract of the Pacific Railway to be useful in the construction of that work. He wished to know if the route of the railroad had been so far established as to admit of the contract of Messrs. Glass, Sifton & Co., about 23 miles, and that had not been placed where the line was completed by any means. No location had been made then, and so far as he (Mr. Schultz) could understand, no location was intended to be made where that line was put up.

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman's statement was incorrect.

"Mr. PLUMB said the line must be put up along the route of the location of the telegraph line, or were the contractors to locate the line for the Government.

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he had already stated the line was to be put up where the road was to be located (these being the Engineer's instructions based upon his original suggestion) and he did not know that a single mile of telegraph line was being erected anywhere except on the line of the road.

"Mr. KIRKPATRICK asked the Premier if he could tell the House whether the line was erected from Fort Edmonton to Cedar Creek. Unless this had been done, and it was known definitely where the line of railway was to run, the contracts had been improperly given out.

* * * * * * *

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said these contracts were given out in accordance with the very letter of the Statute, and the House has voted money to carry them out.

On the 31st March this motion was made in the House, and this discussion took place, and there is a very significant commentary on what took place. According to this document brought down and laid upon the table of the House by the Government, the following significant message was sent to the contractor, Mr. Barnard:—

"OTTAWA, 9th April, 1875.

"Discontinue building of telegraph line, British Columbia, under contract with this Department. You will not be called upon to proceed with the work for some months. At what price would you erect telegraph, say forty-five (45) miles from Quesnel on old telegraph trail, clearing twenty (20) feet wide?

(Signed), "F. BRAUN,
"*Secretary.*"

So that the gentleman who had a binding contract to finish his work by October, 1876, is told to stop his work, and is coolly asked not to send in a tender in accordance with the provision of the Act that no work shall be done except by open public tender, but to put in a statement as to what he would erect 45 miles of telegraph line for. Mr. Barnard's reply is a very significant one:—

"I had completed 50 miles of the line, with the exception of erecting the poles and attaching the wire (which can be done at a small cost) receiving a certificate for $8,000, which has been paid."

So that at the time when the House was informed by the hon. gentleman that no work was being done, except where the railway had been located, $8,000 had been paid to the contractor for work done at a point which it is not known to-day whether it is within 200 miles of the line or not; and Mr.

Barnard shows that he had then involved himself in engagements in trying to fill this Government contract to the extent of $43,720. The Public Accounts show a payment to Mr. Barnard to the 31st December on this work of $1[illegible],284. Now I think that the most incredulous, the most critical gentlemen on the Government side of the House will have some difficulty in relieving himself from the responsibility of saying that a Government who would thus undertake, in violation of a Statute, to expend money contrary to, and in open defiance of the law, and to involve the country in a large amount of utterly useless expenditure in connection with this work, are not fairly chargeable with being open to public censure. Now, Sir, I have drawn attention of the House to the mode in which the Government have failed in their duty in reference to the purchase of steel rails. I have drawn the attention of the House to the mode in which they have failed in their duty in carrying out the railway in connection with the telegraph line; and I have shown that in both cases a large amount of public money has been sacrificed as well as all Parliamentary practice and principle ignored. I will now briefly turn the attention of the House to the mode in which the Government have carried on the contract for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch. As I have stated before, they declared that this was a question of such vital urgency and hot haste that they must go forward, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the hon. gentlemen in opposition that no instrumental survey had been made, and that the Government had no means of informing themselves in relation to the nature of country or the character of the work. The hon. gentleman made a contract for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch. That was in February, 1875, during the time that Parliament was sitting. It would have been better, under the circumstances, considering the extraordinary character of that contract, although he had obtained authority from the House, it would only have been wise to take the House into his confidence before the contract was made. That was not done; nor was the approval of Parliament asked for that contract. I myself put a motion on the paper to condemn the Georgian Bay contract, but the First Minister, by adjourning the House, prevented its being reached. I am not now going to say one word touching the desirability of the work; but one thing is obvious, Sir, that if the work was a mistake, then there is no justification for the step they have taken. If it was a matter of such vital urgency as the First Minister declared to the House, how is he going to justify himself for folding his hands at the end of a couple of years, in relation to this work, which he declared to be so vitally necessary so long ago as November, 1874, two years and a half ago? How did the hon. gentleman discharge his duty to the House and the country in relation to the contract itself. The law was plain. The law declared that he was precluded and prohibited from giving that contract to anybody unless they could satisfy him, and give conclusive evidence, that they possessed a capital of $4,000 per mile. Now, Sir, I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to this fact, that the amount I am stating is far below the sum required by law, for this reason: instead of having 85 miles, according to Mr. Foster, it is 105 miles, and, according to Mr. Fleming, it is 103½ miles; a pretty striking illustration, I think, to the House, of the mode in which the Government plunged blindly and contrary to the remonstrances given them from this side of the House, into the undertaking of this contract at all; but I say that there is a law which precludes the Minister of Public Works from letting one mile of that contract until he had satisfied himself that Mr. Foster possessed the capital of $340,000 according to his own estimate of the distance, under the Act. Now, Sir, what was Mr. Foster's position? The hon. gentleman has been asked, what evidence had you of Mr. Foster's ability to carry on this work; and he was obliged to answer—none; and this with regard to a contract, concerning which the law obliged him to have satisfactory testimony before he let it, that Mr. Foster had a capital of $340,000; and, that is only an insignificant portion of the capital which was

required. The hon. gentleman did not take any means of ascertaining whether Mr. Foster was worth a single dollar; and we all now know that he was not worth a dollar; and that when the contract was let, it was a matter of notoriety, that he had involved himself by the purchase of the Canada Central Railway. He was then bound to the payment of interest which he could not begin to pay at all; and, in fact, no man in the country stood in a more embarrassed condition than Mr. A. B. Foster at the time when the contract was given him. The following telegram, from a daily paper published a few days since, says:

"The financial storm which has overtaken Hon. A. B. Foster, the railway contractor, is due to the following causes:—In 1871 he bought the rights of Mr. Bolckow in the Brockville and Ottawa and Canada Central Railways, on the understanding that he was to pay a certain sum for them in ten years, and to commence paying instalments of the purchase price at the end of five years."

I stated it was no secret that he was struggling with difficulties with this gigantic load of debt around his neck, at the very moment when the contract was given him. It further says:

"The price was large, and in addition he bought from Mr. Bolckow a million and a quarter dollars' worth of iron rails, which he never paid for. The price of the interest in the railways and rails was over two million dollars. He has paid some small amount of interest on the railway purchases, but nothing on the rails. The railway companies have also instituted several suits against Mr. Foster in Ontario, and proceedings have been taken to foreclose on the bonds held by Mr. Bolckow. Several bills of defendant's now running have not yet been sued on. Messrs. O'Halloran, Q.C., and Edward Carter, Q.C., counsel for Mr. Foster, are contesting the writ of attachment on the ground that the affidavit is irregular and insufficient, and also upon the merits charging that the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company, plaintiffs, have no claims whatever against Mr. Foster. The contestation was presented at Sweetsbury to-day."

Now, I say, Sir, that the First Minister is called upon to justify himself to this House, and say why he let this contract in the face of the law, and contrary to law, ignoring all its provisions, and treating Parliament as if they were his creatures instead of being what Parliament always ought to be, the masters of the Government of the day. Parliament always should hold the position of requiring the Government to fulfil the law, or vacate the position that such non-fulfilment shows that they are not worthy to fill; and I say that the hon. gentleman has to justify himself to this House, under these circumstances, for making this enormous contract with Mr. Foster, and making a contract to build a line of railway which they did not know the length of within 20 miles at the time; and upon which no survey had been made, and concerning which no estimate had been prepared. The hon. gentleman violated the law if he has built this work under the Public Works' Act. What does this Act say? It declares that:

"It shall be the duty of the Chief Engineer to prepare maps, plans and estimates for all public works, which are about to be constructed or repaired by the Department."

And yet, Sir, without a plan, without an estimate, without anything whatever, without even a recommendation from the Chief Engineer, this work is entered upon; and that without a survey, without the slightest means being taken to ascertain what ought to be done with reference to a work which was considered of such vital importance that it must be rushed through without Parliament having permission to pass on the contract at all. It was thus undertaken, and a binding contract made by the Government. Well, Sir, that law also was violated; and where are we to-day? Why, to-day we are told that $41,000 of public money have been paid. Why paid? How paid? Upon a certificate of the Chief Engineer? The hon. gentleman has never received such a certificate. The Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway never signed a certificate for a dollar of this $41,000; and, Sir, it was not only paid without such a certificate, but also without proper vouchers. Read the document brought down in relation to this matter! Let the attention of this House be drawn for a moment to the paper—the extraordinary paper laid on the table of the House in connection with this most extraordinary contract, and what will it show? Why, Sir, it will show that we have $41,000 paid on the Georgian Bay contract. It will show, Sir, that we have the contract cancelled; and, Sir, this most extraordinary document will show the mode in which the public work is

carried on. I think that this document will hold a very remarkable position. On November 27th Mr. Foster says:

"We will have the profile of the Canada Central Railway in readiness to submit to the Department in the course of three or four weeks, and the remainder to French River in about two months."

On the 20th December he asks for important modifications. On December 23rd Mr. Fleming advises an extension of time for one year, and that the substitution of 26 miles of navigation would be reasonable. On the 8th of February Mr. Foster says, that his total outlay amounted to $63,000. On the 9th of February, Mr. Fleming says:

"That the proportion payable on an expenditure of $38,864 would be $9,716, less 15 per per cent. to be retained under the 9th section of the contract."

One would suppose that the Government would respect a declaration of that kind from the Chief Engineer, but it appears that this was not the case. It seems that the hon. Minister of Public Works, as I stated before, delights in showing Parliament that he recognizes no authority here or anywhere else, and that anything contained in the Statute-book, or any respect for Parliament is not worth a moment's consideration. On the 28th February a Minute of Council was passed on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, advising that this contract be cancelled, and that the $83,000 which the law required should be deposited as a security for the fulfillment of the contract, should be returned. This deposit belonged to the people of Canada, and it ought not to have been returned, without the sanction of Parliament, to Mr. Foster. That Minute of Council said that:—

"The amount claimed by Mr. Foster to the 1st instant is $38,862.28, $20,000 of which may be safely paid."

On the 28th of April, Mr. Fleming says:

"I find by the accounts furnished by Mr. Foster, that there are only receipts for about $20,000. Accordingly, I would advise that he be called upon to furnish complete vouchers, and that the whole be placed in the Audit Department for examination."

I think that this was a very reasonable and very practical suggestion, and in this the House will quite agree with me. But instead of that being done, instead of the suggestion of the Chief Engineer being carried out—although the First Minister is so ready to fall back on that gentleman to support himself whenever he can do so—it appears it was treated with contempt, and the answer is an Order in Council dated the 6th May, recommending the payment of $36,838.15, and that the balance on the $50,996, the total sum claimed, be paid on the production of vouchers, and this was done, although Mr. Fleming had shown that only $9,716, less 15 per cent., could be paid under the contract.

Mr. MACKENZIE: When did Mr. Fleming say that? Mr. Fleming said in his letter dated February 9th:

"The proportion, therefore, payable on an expenditure of $38,864.28 would be $9,716.07 less 15 per cent. to be retained under the 9th section of the contract."

The difficulty of readily finding these three statements is, that the return is put together in the most extraordinary manner: one half is backwards, and the other half, I was going to say, is upside-down. In the Order of Council, of the 28th of April, Mr. Fleming says:

"I find, of the accounts furnished by Mr. Foster, there are only receipts for about $20,000. Accordingly I would advise that he be called upon to furnish complete vouchers, and that the whole be placed in the Audit Department for examination."

On the 6th of May, a few days afterwards, without any such audit, the Minister of Public Works recommends that $36,838.15 be paid, deducting the sum of $20,000 already paid.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is not the balance of $50,000.

Mr. TUPPER: He further recommends that he be authorized to pay the remaining accounts to an extent not exceeding in the whole the said sum of "$50,966.27, as soon as such vouchers are presented as shall be satisfactory."

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman call that a balance?

Mr. TUPPER: I said the balance on $50,000—that is, the balance remaining on $50,000. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not misunderstand the hon. gentleman. He

said there was a balance of $50,000, and when I called for him to show where that balance was stated he looked for it but could not find it. Now he makes out that he did not mean that. The amount referred to is made up of the following items:—Buildings, &c., at mouth or French River, $9,494.83; survey, 31,838.15; head office expenses and fees to consulting engineer, $5,000; contingent expenses at ten per cent., $4,633; total, $50,966.27. So that instead of there being a balance of $50,000, that is the sum total of the claim of Mr. Foster, and which the Ministers recommended should be paid as soon as such vouchers were presented as were satisfactory, first as to the character and usefulness of the work at French River; and, secondly, the actual payment of the several sums for purposes defined in the Order in Council of February the 5th, 1876.

Mr. TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman understood me to say there was a balance of $50,000, after the $36,838 were paid, he misunderstood me. I meant that the value, $50,966, was the whole amount claimed by Mr. Foster. I do not want to detain the House while I read the whole amended Order in Council. I said that Mr. Fleming stated that he could only find receipts for $20,000; and that Mr. Fleming advised that Mr. Foster be called upon to furnish complete vouchers, and that the whole be placed in the Audit Department for examination; but, instead of that, as far as any evidence given to the House shows, no such audit took place. The hon. the Minister of Public Works recommended that $36,838.15 be paid, and also that the balance on $50,966.27 be paid on production of vouchers. I trust I have made myself clear to the hon. gentleman. It does not require the slightest exaggeration in order to make the case sufficiently strong, as I think I have convinced the hon. gentleman. We come now to the case of the Canada Central Railway. I have shown to the House the mode in which Mr. Foster is dealt with. That a contract is made with him without his showing that he had sufficient capital to carry it out; that he entered upon the work; and that he got a certain amount for that work. And if the House wants to know more as to the character of that work, it can refer to Mr. Ridout, who had been appointed by the Government in charge of that work, and who, a short time before these payments were made, gave a most remarkable history of the mode in which the work was proceeded with. On the 22nd of Nov., Mr. Ridout, who had been sent to examine the work, says that Mr. Foster's engineer, Mr. Harris, was unable afford him any positive information of the result of their surveys so far as made, having only in his office a few rough pieces of profiles and maps of portions of the early surveys in a very unfinished state, no proper profiles or map having as yet been made. If the House will turn to the Journals for 1875, they will find the terms on which the Government was authorized by this House to make a contract in relation to the Canada Central. What were they?—

"That the Company shall, within one month from the ratification of this Order in Council, by the House of Commons, satisfy the Minister of Public Works that they have entered into a *bona fide* contract or contracts for the building of the railway, and have provided sufficient means, with the Government bonus, to secure the completion of the line on or before the 1st day of January, 1877, and also that the company shall, from the date of such contracts, make continuously such progress as will justify the hope of the completion of the line within the time mentioned."

Now, there is the basis on which the Government alone could make a contract, and the terms upon which alone they could make any payment. In the first instance I want to know with whom they made the contract? They are obliged by law, they are compelled by the action of the House to ascertain that this Company have sufficient means with that bonus to complete the work by the 1st January, 1877, and they are only permitted by their Order in Council to make a contract with parties who proved beyond peradventure they had the means. Whom did they make it with? They made it with Mr. A. B. Foster, not content with giving the contract for the Georgian Bay Branch, in which they were required by law to have proof that he had a capital of $340,000. They gave another contract for the Canada Central to the same man with-

out the slightest evidence that he possessed a single dollar, or had the means of doing anything whatever. It is then apparent that this contract was made in the teeth of the Order in Council with a party that the Order in Council excludes from making such contract at all, limiting, as it does, the payment to a person who had made the contract and was not making such continuous progress as would complete it within the time. Yet $68,000 of the public money of the country has been paid over to this Mr. A. B. Foster, in violation of the express terms of the act of this House, and without the evidence that he was doing anything at all except those imperfect surveys, which are treated with much contempt by the Government Engineer who was sent up to see what he was doing and on what pretext he was claiming to be paid. He was paid all the money he professed to have expended on his surveys, and that without vouchers or audit; without the authority of law, and in opposition to express terms of his contract, then he was paid $68,000 on the pretext that he had deposited a lot of iron rails somewhere. The line is not located, the surveys have not been finished according to Mr. Flemming's statement and Mr. Ridout's statement. No one knows where the line is to begin, whether twenty miles from Renfrew or not, because the estimated eighty-five miles from Burnt Lake to the Georgian Bay, turned out to be 105 miles; so that from the vicinity of Douglas to Burnt Lake it would not, improbably, be 140 miles if the same in accurate estimate was made, So they do not know if these rails, what few are left of them, are now within twenty miles of where the line was to commence. These iron rails were shown to be of the most worthless character, but they were valued by Mr. Foster, during the past season, at $48 a ton and he was paid $68,000 on them at that rate. That is not the worst, it will probably turn out that these rails are owned by parties in England, but if they are of no more value than we have reason to suppose, it is of very little consequence what became of them. It is said that what were used for ballasting were worn out, they were so utterly worthless. After Mr. Foster is paid $68,000 in violation of the law, in violation of the Order in Council, which required him to be going on continuously with the work and showing that he could complete this contract, he coolly asked the loan of 100 tons of those rails; and this good-natured Government, this Government which seems to be owned by Mr. Foster, say very well, but you must deposit some security, so he deposited some South Eastern Railway bonds; and when we asked the First Minister, who had no more authority to take and lend that 100 tons of rails than to lend money out of the Treasury, after paying more than twice as much as they were worth, what security did you get?—he says South Eastern Railway bonds. We asked if he knew whether they are worth anything; No! he says he is unable to say that they can be sold at all, and I believe for the best reason, that they have, as far as I can ascertain, no marketable value. Then, Sir, when gentlemen in opposition, patient and enduring as we are, ready to pass over almost anything that is not of such a grave nature as to compel us to do our duty to the country, when we call attention to it, and it is a matter of investigation what turns out to be the fact? Why that instead of 100 tons being gone, there are 227 tons gone, and without any authority, without any security, without any pretence, without even the formality of asking for the last 127 tons. I do the Government the justice to say that I believe they were ignorant of the fact; that this property which had been paid for, that this property which belonged to the country was being used by Mr. Foster as if it was his own private property. That is the condition of things on which I think we are justified in asking the House to say it cannot agree to endorse the policy of the Government, or the mode in which the Canadian Pacific Railway has been carried out. I must say something about a most remarkable transaction, that is, a report brought down, I believe, to the Senate—at all events, it is a public document—showing what is going on at the interesting section of the country called

"Thunder Bay." I said before, that I would carefully guard myself against using a word or throwing out insinuations which might be construed into a personal assault or anything outside of the necessary criticism of this work as a public transaction.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Do not spare yourself.

Mr. TUPPER: I wish I could be spared, I believe the Minister of Public Works—unlike me—is incapable of appreciating the pain it gives me to be compelled to criticise the conduct of any public man as my duty obliges me to criticise his. If he knew the pleasure it gave me to say, as I did two years ago, that I believed there was no man in this country better able to fill the office of Minister of Public Works than himself, he would appreciate the pain with which I am now forced to admit that I was no prophet, and that the administration of his department has obliged me to reconsider that compliment which I was so happy to be able to bestow, in this House, upon the hon. gentleman. But Sir, I have shown that this railway line was taken down there, and this branch commenced without the authority of Parliament. There is no law for the construction of the Thunder Bay branch. We have been told that this is an economical Government. Well, we have had a specimen of their economy in this connection. But when I tell the House that the Return brought down shows that over $51,000 have been paid for about a mile of right of way at Kaministiquia, that wild and unsettled country, they can form some conception of how the Government are expending the public money. Here is a country which has been described—and I need not describe again—by the hon the Minister of Finance as a road running through an unpeopled desert, and which $51,000 would almost have bought the fee simple of a few years ago. No doubt the value of property has risen from the fact of the Government locating the road there, but it is an important question for discussion, why it should have gone to that point instead of to Prince Arthur's Landing, or why it should have gone to a place which lengthens the road.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It shortens the road.

Mr. TUPPER: Any person looking at the map distributed to the House, will find that the one line is curved, and the other almost direct. But I believe I am right in saying that private enterprise is building a line to Prince Arthur's Landing, and that the Government of Ontario have subsidized the line to the extent of $2,000 per mile to make this connection. I believe that returns brought down to the House proves that Mr. Ballairge has shown that there are forty-three days more of navigation to Prince Arthur's Landing than to the point where the Government are making the terminus of the line. I am now quoting from the report brought down by the Government. Mr. Ballairge is a gentleman of high attainments, a gentleman who has been long in the Public Works Department, and who was sent up specially to examine into this question, and this is his report. It may be worthy the consideration of the House or it may be not.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It cannot be correct.

Mr. TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman says it is not correct he is correcting his own return submitted on the authority of his own Engineer. I do not want to detain the House, and will, therefore, pass over that without taking time to turn over authorities; but whenever the accuracy of any statement I make is challenged, I think I shall be just as likely to give as decisive testimony as I have given now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Where is that report?

Mr. TUPPER: It is the report relating to the Port Francis Locks or Canal.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him, because I do not think he deliberately intended to mislead the House. The date the hon. gentleman quoted has no reference to the river or Thunder Bay at all; it is the chain of lakes away in the interior, 200 miles from this.

Mr. TUPPER: I will show the House that if any person is to blame it is the one who made the report. The hon. gentleman calls Kaministiquia the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I assumed, as this return says: "River Kaministiquia, the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway," and puts the words: "opening 25th May, and closing 20th October opposite," that it applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The figures are not opposite.

Mr. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman will see if I am inaccurate in the statement that inaccuracy has followed the extraordinary way in which this return has described the terminus. Mr. Ballairge has put down navigation as opening on the 25th May and closing on the 26th October. He may not have meant that, but it is certainly calculated to give that impression, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The return will not read that way at all.

Mr. TUPPER: I read it in that way, and I am glad if there is any error, that the hon. gentleman has drawn attention to it because I can assure him I am most anxious to avoid the slightest error of statement in criticizing these matters. But at all events, there is a considerable difference between the opening and closing of navigation at the two points.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. TUPPER: Why, even the hon. gentleman's own correction admits considerable difference, and when we take into consideration, Sir, the fact, we are building 400 miles of railway from Thunder Bay to the Red River, and that we are going to this enormous expenditure of public money for the construction of a road that is to be practically useless for something like at least six months in the year, it does become important, Sir, even to the extent of a few days as to the opening of navigation; but Sir, I did not propose to discuss whether or an error had been made or not in the selection of one point or the other; but I want to draw the attention of the House to this point, the amount paid for the right of way at Kaministiquia. Now, Sir, it is perfectly obvious that the location of a railway enormously increases the value of land; but I deny that speculators—and those people are declared to be speculators; it is so stated in this document which has been brought down by the Government—and persons who have gone in to purchase land on speculation at a mere nominal figure, have a right to be paid by the Government the increased value of their land owing to the location of the railway there. When the Intercolonial Railway was located, the principle observed by the Government and by the Commissioners in the payment for right of way, was the rational principle of paying the amount that the land would have been worth if the railroad had not been located there, because it is perfectly obvious that this was all the parties owning it were entitled to.

Mr. BOWELL: That is all the Act allowed.

Mr. TUPPER: Yes; that is all the Act allowed; and all it ought to allow, because it is perfectly apparent that the Government would pay, otherwise, twice the increased value of the land and that when the parties are in most instances only too glad to give the right of way. It is true that this appears on the papers to have been a town, but it was a town without any houses. I believe that after they made up their minds to sell to the Government, a rough shanty was erected on it to give it additional value, but all the streets and everything else about it existed only on paper and in the imagination of these wise and prudent speculators who managed to pocket the people's money without giving any equivalent consideration for it. Now, Sir, what do you suppose was paid by the Intercolonial Railroad Commissioners for the right of way on 500 miles, in round numbers, of the line of the Intercolonial Railway? and this was not through a wild and unsettled country like Kaministiquia, but it ran in many places through the finest, the most arable and the most valuable land to be found in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New

Brunswick and Quebec—only about $273,000; and, Sir, I may say that eighty miles of right of way, with station grounds, gravel pits and everything Government required in connection with the construction of the road, through Nova Scotia in the splendid counties of Cumberland and Colchester, through the town of Truro, and through the village of Amherst, including damages to buildings and for buildings, and for everything else, cost only about $3,000 more than for this mile of right of way at Kaministiquia. What will the House say when I tell them that, according to the rate paid for the roadway at Thunder Bay, the Government have paid at the rate of nearly three millions of money more than for the whole cost of constructing the Intercolonial Railway with all the appurtenances, and with all the rolling stock, and with everything else on it; and that, in fact, these 500 miles, according to the rate paid at Thunder Bay, would have cost instead of $272,420, which was the entire cost of 500 miles through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and Quebec, $25,709,500 for the right of way alone; such would have been the cost, had the owners of land on the Intercolonial been paid at the same rate as these speculators at Kaministiquia, who have thus been permitted to pocket the people's money, Sir, I only need to draw the attention of the House to these figures to show that the most wasteful extravagance in the use of the public money has been exhibited by the Government in relation to that matter.

An hon. GENTLEMAN: Who got it?

Mr. TUPPER: An hon. gentleman asks me who got it; but to answer that would take me to another branch of the subject, which, as I stated at the outset, I wanted to avoid; I must, therefore, decline to say anything with reference to that enquiry. But, Sir, I now come to another matter in connection with this work, and that is—the Fort Francis Locks. I will not refer to it at length, and I will not occupy much of the time of the House with it, because it has been laid before the House previously; but I must say this, Sir, that the policy of the Government was stated in very distinct terms in 1875 by the Minister of Public Works, and it was this:—

"In addition, therefore, to the railway surveys from Lake Shebandowan to Lake Superior, a distance of 48 miles, and from Red River to Rat Portage, a distance of 114 miles, we have felt it desirable to make correct surveys, during the season, of the intervening distance. The entire distance from Red River to Lake Superior is, in round numbers, 430 miles by the Dawson route, of this we have surveyed and asked for tenders for 155 or 160 miles. This leaves a distance between the two points of 270 miles, of that distance we will be able, by constructing two cheap wooden locks at Fort Francis, to obtain from Rat Portage uninterrupted steam navigation for a distance of nearly 200 miles to Sturgeon Falls at the east end of Rainy Lake."

He further says:

"We hope within two years, or two and a half at the outside, that we will have a railway finished at the eastern and western ends, and, with these and the locks at Fort Francis, we expect that the distance altogether may be traversed in four or five days at the outside, that now takes on the average from nine to twelve days"

That was the policy of the Government as avowed in 1875; and I may state that the policy announced in the speech of the hon. gentlemen in submitting the Railway Act of 1874, was the immediate construction of a through line of railway from Lake Superior to Red River. In 1875, a year afterwards, that policy was abandoned, and it was proposed to substitute for it a mixed route of land and water—270 miles of navigation with a short line of railway at each end. The attention of the hon. Minister was drawn in forcible terms, from this side of the House, to the fact that as on the United States side there was a line from Duluth to Red River, it was utterly impossible to suppose that we could complete by 150 miles of Railway at the two ends of the route, and half a dozen or eight portages to cross, and 270 miles of navigation; and that all the money expended on it would be thrown away. The hon. gentleman then revised his policy and again changed it, undertaking to construct a through line of railway from Thunder Bay direct to Red River. When, Sir, that was done, it was assumed that this expenditure, which would have been thrown away in any case, and utterly useless, if a direct line of railway was made, would be abandoned, and that no further expenditure of money should take place on it. It appears, however, that, while

undertaking to construct as rapidly as the location of a through line of railway would permit, a through railway, the Government have at the same time expended over $100,000 of public money, not on any portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but on these locks at Fort Francis, and in that direction. Now, Sir, I have said that this report, in reference to Mr. Foster, was a marvellous report, but it is in fact rather thrown into the shade, if anything, by the Fort Francis Locks report. What do we find? We find that, although the Public Works' Act says, that the Government must have the specifications of the engineer in all works constructed by that Department, they had no specifications, and that a Mr. Sutherland—who he is I know not—of Orillia, is called in hot haste to go and take charge of the work, and actually commence excavations without an estimate, without a plan, without engineering, or anything else. A more astounding series of statements, except for gentlemen who are conversant with these papers, which have recently been brought down, could scarcely be presented to the House, than those papers which are before us at present. Why, Sir, they show that there were no tenders. The law says that the Government must have tenders. The vote is for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every dollar expended is expended under that Act, or under no Act at all. If they have expended it under the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, then, as my right hon. friend has stated, they are acting contrary to law, for they did it without tender; and if it was expended under the Public Works Act, then it was contrary to law, because they have no vote for it and no authority. Sir, it will be seen by the Public Works Act that, in that case, they would be violating the Act. It says:

"Nothing in this Act shall give authority to the Minister to cause expenditure not previously sanctioned by Parliament, except for such repairs and alterations as the interest of the public service shall require."

Sir, in that case, whether it was expended under the Pacific Railway Act, or under the Public Works' Act, the Government cannot proceed without estimates, without plans, and without surveys by the Engineer; and yet you find that you have, as in the other return, to read this book backwards, and that when you have got to the end of the chapter, after the money has been spent, you get an estimate, and that after the Government has expended over $100,000, they find that it is desirable to have an estimate, and send a gentleman up there to furnish them with one. On the 11th May, 1875, Mr. Braun writes to Mr. Sutherland that:

"Pending the arrival from Ottawa of such instructions, you will proceed with the excavations first of the whole of the earth-work, and afterwards of such portions of the work as must necessarily be taken out."

On July 24th Mr. Sutherland is informed:

"Full instructions have been sent to Mr. Hazlewood to proceed to Fort Francis and prepare a full and complete design for the whole work."

On the 2nd August following, Mr. Hazlewood wrote to Mr. Braun:

"DEAR SIR,—Your communications, Nos. 31,203 and 31,204, with enclosures, are to hand. I shall give the canal question at Fort Francis my best attention. I have brought Mr. Mortimer down to work upon the plans, and as soon as they are ready I shall not lose a moment in forwarding them to Ottawa. In the meantime I may state that I approve of the location selected by Mr. Mortimer for the canal at Fort Francis."

Mr. MACKENZIE: On the 11th May Mr. Braun had written to Mr. Sutherland:

"On reaching Fort Francis you will see Mr. Mortimer, resident engineer, who will be at once instructed to take soundings with a view to determine the exact points at which it would be most desirable to construct the canal locks at each, and you will then as speedily as possible ascertain the nature of the rock and the depth of various points, so that Mr. Mortimer can make a section."

And on the 5th July—a month before the hon. gentleman said he had been instructed to go there—wrote:

"According to instructions received from Mr. Hazlewood, I have made the necessary profile, and have laid out the ground for the locks on Rainy River at this place."

Mr. MACKENZIE: Now, does the hon. gentleman mean to mix up these dates with the view of misleading the House?

Mr. TUPPER: I will now read from the document brought down by the hon. the First Minister himself. The first thing to be noticed is the extraordinary statement that:

"In the return prepared for the House in the matter of the Fort Francis Locks, there is wanting the report of Mr. S. Hazlewood, giving an estimate of the cost of the works. The report is mislaid, but Mr. Hazlewood has been written to for a copy of it."

I believe among all the documents with reference to an important public work that perhaps is the most extraordinary statement that could be found. On May 11th, a letter was sent to Mr. Sutherland, signed by Mr. Braun, stating:

"When you reach Fort William you will see Mr. Walter Oliver, and, if he has finished the work entrusted to him, he will accompany you to assist in taking charge of the men. Mr. James Macdonald and Mr. Oliver will act as foremen under you, either in the woods or at the works, as you may deem desirable."

An HON. MEMBER: What Mr. Oliver is that?

Mr. TUPPER I don't know. This Fort Francis Lock appears to have been a happy preserve for the needy friends of the Government, who could be shipped up there out of the reach of any one. Did any one ever hear of a resident engineer being the person to prepare plans and to authorize the construction of a public work? What does the hon. First Minister take the House for? Does he not suppose that we know that a resident engineer is generally a person with—merely sufficient knowledge of engineering to enable him to carry out the instructions of his superior officers. Long months afterwards it was found that Mr. Mortimer's information was all wrong, that he had not the proper depth of the locks or anything connected with it; and that was the best evidence that Mr. Mortimer was not a competent engineer. On the 24th July, Mr. Sutherland is written to as follows:

"These instructions necessarily include the re-examination of the line recommended by yourself and Mr. Mortimer, and should Mr. Hazlewood conceive it necessary to make any change in the location, you will defer to his opinions, and carry on the work on the amended line he may trace out, should he conceive that course to be necessary."

Now, I ask, in the history of Canada, was ever a public work proceeded with in such a manner as that? I do not think there was. At all events it was done in deliberate defiance of the Public Works' Act, and without any sufficient authority. Everything like law and precedent, and everything that savours of Parliamentary Government were thrown to the wind because the hon. the First Minister decided that the work should be commenced at once. Every person knew that the engineer in charge should have control and power over the work. But Mr. Hazlewood was written to as follows:—

"As the site where Mr. Sutherland will commence his excavation has been recommended by Mr. Mortimer equally as by himself, there is fair reason to look forward to the line selected by them being approved by yourself."

I have never heard of such instructions given to an engineer. It was a direct hint to him how to make up his mind. Would it be supposed that, under such circumstances as those, the work of excavation should have been ordered by the hon. the Minister of Public Works on the 11th May? On the 18th April, 1876, nearly a year afterwards, Mr. Braun wrote to Mr. Sutherland:—

"SIR,—I am directed to forward you herewith a copy of plan of lock at Fort Francis, prepared by Mr. Page, which has been approved of by the Minister. I am to authorize you to resume work on the said lock by day labour, and to request that you will submit to the Department an estimate of the probable monthly expenditure for the next twelve months."

This letter was sent, although the work had been commenced nearly a year before under the direction of the Minister of Public Works. And yet the hon. gentleman would insinuate that I was not doing justice to these statements, because I did not read them in detail. We at last get something practical. It is the report signed by Mr. Baillairge, who had been instructed on the 30th August to proceed to Fort Francis. Mr. Baillairge said in effect that all the money had been thrown away, and that the work was practically useless unless a great deal more money was spent upon it; and showed that the work had proved an utter delusion. He said:—

"The object for which the Fort Francis Canal is being constructed cannot be obtained unless Rainy River is improved so as to ensure the requisite draft, and the ascent of vessels against the current in the rapid."

He goes on to speak of the mode of improvement, and says:—

"No definite scheme or estimate can, however, be submitted, unless the necessary levels, soundings and measurements are taken along the entire line of the proposed navigation."

It is thus shown that about a year after this work was in progress an Engineer of the Public Works Department was sent up to the locality and found the Government had not taken the first preliminary step required to be taken before the money was expended. But he gave on 1st September, 1876, a very remarkable statement. He said:

"Sir,—Having been instructed on the 3rd ult., by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works to examine the Fort Francis Canal, now under your charge, and to give such directions as I may deem advisable, I herewith enclose for your guidance a specification of the work to be done according to the revised plan with which you have lately been furnished.

"This plan was prepared from somewhat limited information, and is based on the high and low water levels originally observed by the engineer who first laid out the work; the low water levels have since been found to be fourteen inches lower at the lower end than represented on the plan. I have, therefore, appended to the specification a list of levels, showing the elevation of the main portions of the work, so as to suit the highest and lowest water levels observed up to the present time."

So we have, in regard to this work upon which the excavations were commenced on 11th May, 1875, a statement made by Mr. Baillairge on 1st Sept., 1876, that they were mistaken as to the first principles and initial steps necessary to the very inception of the work. Mr. Baillairgé continues:

"As it is important to ascertain the extent and nature of the obstructions, and the cost of removing or overcoming the same, you are hereby requested to examine the sections of the channel referred to, and such other points as may appear doubtful, during the season of lowest water, and to furnish the Department with a report thereon, together with an estimate of the probable cost of improving the channel for the required draught from Rainy Lake to the Lake of the Woods."

I hope I have satisfied the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and in reading the text of this remarkable document, I have given the House the best evidence that the work was undertaken without any knowledge of the subject, and after $100,000 were expended an engineer was sent to investigate and report on the work, showing, in the most conclusive manner, that the information which the hon. the Minister of Public Works was bound to have obtained before entering upon the undertaking was not fully obtained until one year and a half after the work was commenced; and, in fact, a more reckless, illegal, unjustifiable expenditure of public money had never been made by any person in this country. In the report of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, on page 26, what do we find? We find that at this place where Fort Francis Lock is being constructed with seven feet of water on the sills, for forty miles there is a depth of only four feet and a half; yet the public money is used without plans, specifications, or authority of the Chief Engineer; or without any recommendation under which one dollar could be expended, and the hon. gentleman makes an expenditure of $100,000, which unless followed up by an expenditure of half a million more, will not accomplish the object proposed. But suppose the works would be completed, what then? Does any one suppose that with a railway from Duluth to Red River, a single ton of freight would be carried by that route? As regards the transportation of rails, by this route there would be eight portages, involving sixteen times loading and unloading, putting the rails into waggons and taking them out again; and the most insane Minister of Public Works would not undertake to transport one ton of heavy freight of any description by any such line. Yet, the hon gentleman adhered to the policy he had presented before he had undertaken to construct a direct line from Thunder Bay to Red River, and went on with this expenditure. But the amount was not charged to current expenditure, as, under the late Government, all expenditures in connection with the Dawson Route were charged. I draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to the fact that, when he is comparing the expenditure of 1873-74 and subsequent years, all such expenditures under the late Government were charged to current revenue, and not chargable to capital under this Government. All these expenditures are made in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and thus hundreds of thousands of dollars were expended without having any more connection with the railway than if it was spent in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. I am happy to say that the duty I have laid upon myself is drawing to a close. I think I have given to the House sufficient reason in relation to the

policy of the Government, and the mode in which they have carried out that policy, for passing a moderate censure, the moderate censure that I propose—that this House cannot approve of the policy of the Government. We cannot approve of it, because Ministers have violated their principles and their pledges; because the men who declared to the Canadian public that the railway never would be built by any other mode than by a private company, aided by a grant of land and money, had, so soon as they obtained power, trampled the principles propounded and the pledges given to the people, under their feet, and shown that what they meant was that no other Government should, in this way, handle the public money, and be able to deal with the public requirements, but themselves. The moment they were entrusted with power, in consequence, I suppose, of their high purity and independence of character, they thought it would be safe to change the whole policy, and to take the work into their own hands, although it would involve an enormous direct expenditure by the Government. I ask the support of the House to the amendment because the Government have violated their pledges given to the people, that if power was conceded to them it would never be abused, and the great cardinal principle of their policy would be that not one dollar would be expended without a direct vote of Parliament. I have shown that millions have been expended, I may say millions wasted, without having a vote of Parliament for a single dollar. I am justified in asking the House to pass this censure upon the Government, because their proceedings have been unconstitutional and illegal, and they have violated the law under which they are constructing this work, with respect to the declaration that public tenders must be invited, and the work performed by contract. They have expended public moneys without tenders. I have shown that they have, in an unconstitutional manner, because, without any vote of Parliament, they have undertaken to pledge the good faith of Canada to the payment of millions, and by a reckless purchase have saddled the country with a dead loss of over a million and a half, involving an annual charge upon our treasury of $75,000 for ever. I have shown that, in addition to their vacillating policy,—a policy changing from hour to hour, a policy of a mixed route one day and an all-rail route the next, of carrying on the works by a private company one day and by the Government the next, and now they propose to revert to the former when they have destroyed all chance of success. I have shown that even in dealing with the small matter of the right of way in an unsettled and unpeopled district at Kaministiquia, the payment made was such that it applied to payment of the right of way for the Intercolonial, which passed in large sections through a settled country, many sections passing through most valuable lands, the amount would have been more than the whole cost of the Intercolonial by something more than three millions of dollars. I have shown you that their policy was a breach of faith, because they have pledged themselves to British Columbia; they have pledged themselves to the Imperial Government, to construct a railway on Vancouver Island, and to construct a railway from the shores of the Pacific to the shores of Lake Superior by 1890, without any qualification or restriction whatever, both of which they have abandoned. I have shown you that their expenditure during the past year was in contravention of the decision of the House, as arrived at by the resolution of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), because the hon. the First Minister knows that he cannot say it is not increasing the taxation of the country. With the $3,000,000 of additional taxation, levied when they first obtained power, gone, with an admitted deficit of $2,000,000 during the past year, with the demand upon the House this Session for $500,000 more to meet the ordinary expenditure of the country, I defy the hon. gentleman to say that every dollar he expends on the Canadian Pacific Railway does not increase the existing rate of taxation. And, if it does, I say the resolution, prepared, as I believe it was, by the Government, and put into the hands of the hon. member for West Middlesex, and sustained, as it was, by them, was a complete

B2395

breach of faith of the solemn, binding obligation the Government had made with British Columbia, and with the Imperial Government, that they would proceed with and construct the road within the time stated. The hon. the First Minister stated, in his manifesto to the country, in reference to the connection of immigation to this work :

"We shall endeavour to make these great works auxiliary to the promotion of immigration on an extended scale, and to the settlement and development of these rich and fertile territories on which our hopes for the future of Canada are so largely fixed."

Is there a man in Canada who did not concur in the sentiment propounded there ? Is there a man in Canada, who knows anything of the great and fertile country spoken of, who does not think that the future hopes of Canada are, to a large extent, necessarily fixed on that country ? And, yet, what has been the record of the hon. gentleman ? Dealing with the public money with unstinted hand—for Parliament has been ready to place anything demanded in the hon. gentleman's hands—what has been done ? Instead of making his Canadian Pacific Railway policy accomplish what every person believes might be accomplished in connection with the settlement of that country—every one knows that one of the prime considerations in connection with this great work was that it would afford the means of giving valuable, remunerative employment to the immigrants brought into the country to people that magnificent territory—yet the Government have done absolutely nothing towards that end. Was there ever a Government in the position this Government was in, with this matter in their hands, with a support in Parliament such as few Governments have ever possessed, and with the opportunity of advancing the interests of the country in that way without measure and without bounds. And, yet, what is the record to-day ? The record of Votes and Proceedings of yesterday shows that the number of immigrants brought to this country in 1883, when not a mile of this road was under contract, was three times as great as during the past year ; that while the cost per head of bringing immigrants to the country has been enormously increased, we stand in the position, that instead of the construction of this great work bringing a tremendous immigration and advancing the interests of Canada in the way the hon. the First Minister held out to the country when he made this address to the people, those expectations have utterly failed ; and that notwithstanding all this expenditure in connection with the work, it has not been attended by increased influx of immigrants, but, on the contrary, a large and rapid decline has taken place. I have referred already to the violation of law, the utter disregard of Parliamentary authority, and the enormous payments of money connected with the Georgian Bay Branch and the Canada Central Railroad, in violation of the one and contempt of the other. The whole policy of the Government, as propounded by the hon. gentleman, has been utterly delusive, and to-day we find ourselves without any advance, without anything accomplished, but minus a large sum of money which has been paid to parties, who, contrary to the law, were entrusted to carry out contracts. I am sorry that I have been obliged to trespass on the indulgence of the House so long, but I think I have adduced sufficient to support the motion which I now have the honour to move. I have endeavoured, and I think the hon. the First Minister will agree with me in the statement, to avoid every question that could raise an unpleasant topic of discussion between the occupants of the Treasury Benches and ourselves. Notwithstanding the great temptation that was presented as I proceeded in this discussion, I have carefully endeavoured to give a simple statement of facts presented by the Government themselves, as brought down in public documents ; and if I have not established successfully that the Government have failed in their duty to the country, and that the course they have pursued on this great question has been detrimental to the interests of the country, then I have no grounds on which to ask for the support of this House. But I feel that the case that has been presented is one which entitles me confidently to ask your support, and if I do not obtain it from this House there is an equally

independant tribunal in this country to which I can confidently look for the affirmation of this motion which I have now the honour to offer. Thanking the House for their indulgence at this late period of the Session which they have kindly given on the ground of the vast importance of the subject, and deeply regretting my own physical inability, under the circumstances in which I was compelled to address the House, to deal with the question as vigorously as the interests of the country demand, I beg leave to offer the following resolution:—

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be Resolved, That this House cannot approve of the course pursued by this Government with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway."

MacLean Roger & Co., Parliamentary and Departmental Printers, Ottawa, Ont.